Calendar No. 284

98TH CONGRESS, 1st Session } SENATE { REPORT No. 98-179

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1984

JULY 14 (legislative day, JULY 11), 1983.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 3329]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 3329) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes, reports to the Senate with various amendments, and presents herewith information relative to the changes recommended.

AMOUNTS IN NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY) FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984

Amount of bill passed by House	$11,299,897,225
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	10,855,555,225
Amount of budget estimates, 1984	10,913,472,025

S183-11

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Page

Narrative summary 5
Total obligational authority 5

EQUITY IN TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

Equity in transportation funding 5

TITLE I: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Salaries and expenses 9
Transportation planning, research, and development 11
Working capital fund 12

Coast Guard

Acquisition, construction, and improvements 17
Alteration of bridges 18
Deepwater port liability fund 21
Offshore oil pollution compensation fund 21
Operating expenses 14
Research, development, test, and evaluation 20
Reserve training 19
Retired pay 19
National recreational boating safety and facilities improvement fund 22

Federal Aviation Administration

Aircraft purchase loan guarantee 47
Construction, Metropolitan Washington airports 46
Facilities and equipment 36
Grants-in-aid for airports 38
Headquarters administration 24
Operation and maintenance, Metropolitan Washington airports 41
Operations 27
Research, engineering, and development 38
Washington airports policy 41

Federal Highway Administration

Access highways to public recreation areas 55
Federal-aid highways (liquidation of contract authorization) (trust fund) 52
Highway-related safety grants (liquidation of contract authorization) (trust fund) .. 51
Highway safety research and development 51
Interstate transfer grants-highways 54
Limitation on general operating expenses 49
Motor carrier safety 50
Motor carrier safety grants 50
Railroad-highway crossings demonstration projects 52
Right-of-way revolving fund (limitation on direct loans) (trust fund) 54
Waste isolation pilot project roads 55

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

Page

Highway traffic safety grants (liquidation of contract authorization) 58
Operations and research 56

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

Alaska railroad revolving fund 67
Conrail labor protection 64
Grants to National Railroad Passenger Corporation 66
Northeast corridor improvement program 65
Office of the Administrator 60
Rail service assistance 62
Railroad rehabilitation and improvement financing funds 67
Railroad research and development 62
Railroad safety 60
Redeemable preference shares 67
Rock Island labor protection 65

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

Administrative expenses 69
Discretionary grants 72
Formula grants 71
Interstate transfer grants-transit 76
Research, development, and demonstrations and university research and training 69
Washington Metro 77

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Limitation on administrative expenses 77

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

Research and special programs 79

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Salaries and expenses 80

TITLE II: RELATED AGENCIES

Airline Deregulation Study Commission 93
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board 82
Civil Aeronautics Board:
  Salaries and expenses 85
  Airline deregulation 87
  Payments to air carriers 89
Interstate Commerce Commission 90
National Transportation Safety Board 82
Panama Canal Commission:
  Capital outlay 92
  Operating expenses 91
United States Railway Association 93
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority 94

TITLE III: GENERAL PROVISIONS

General provisions 95

RULES COMPLIANCE STATEMENTS

	Page
Budgetary impact statement	96
Rule 16, paragraph 7	95

Summary of Major Recommendations

The major items contained in the bill include:

1. The appropriation of $1,660,806,000 for the operating expenses of the Coast Guard;
2. A total of $370,900,000 for the capital acquisition, construction, and improvement programs of the Coast Guard;
3. The appropriation of $2,556,900,000 for operations and headquarters administration of the Federal Aviation Administration;
4. A provision providing for obligations of not to exceed $800,000,000 for airport development and planning grants;
5. A total of $750,000,000 for facilities and equipment of the Federal Aviation Administration;
6. An obligation limitation of $12,600,000,000 for Federal-aid highways;
7. An obligation limitation of $100,000,000 for the State and community highway safety grants, and $37,950,000 for alcohol safety incentive grants;
8. The appropriation of $35,000,000 for Rock Island labor protection;
9. The appropriation of $718,000,000 for grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (AMTRAK);
10. An obligation ceiling of $1,200,000,000 for the mass transit capital fund; and
11. The appropriation of $270,000,000 for interstate transfer grants—transit.

Total Obligational Authority Provided—General Funds and Trust Funds

In addition to the appropriation of $10,855,555,225 in new budget authority for fiscal year 1984, large amounts of obligational authority are provided by law without consideration by the annual appropriations process. The principal items in this category are the trust funded programs for Federal-aid highways, for the mass transit capital fund, and for airport development grants. For fiscal year 1984, estimated obligations for such programs approach $15,000,000,000.

EQUITY IN TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

It is axiomatic that the Nation's long-term economic growth depends heavily on the adequacy of its transportation infrastructure. While the declining condition of transportation systems and their capacity to meet existing and future needs have been the subject of intense congressional concern in recent years, the country cannot afford to lose its focus on these concerns now that a significant series of authorizing acts has been completed. With approximately 70 percent of Department of Transportation funds originating in user fees, care must be taken to faithfully implement the program levels for which user fees were recently increased. It falls primarily upon this Committee to address those commitments within the difficult context of controlling spending and restraining the Federal deficit.

With ever-increasing pressure over the past several years, these budgetary constraints are forcing more stringent review of spending priorities in transportation. The outcome of this in fiscal terms is desirable indeed, but there exists no clear roadmap suggesting by what benchmarks decisions should be made among many meritorious choices. After considerable testimony, debate, and thought, the Committee believes that this conundrum boils down to a series of equity questions and choices.

In considering the equitable allocation of transportation resources, we must certainly reject as inappropriate any concept implying pure balance, since the essence of the Committee's deliberations must be judgment and the principle of reasonable, if not necessarily even, allocation.

Outlined in the following paragraphs are only a few of the numerous equity questions and choices on transportation now facing Congress.

Railroads.—These historical beneficiaries of land grants were once regulated in the public interest as utilities, but are now free to set rates and routes pretty much as they please. While branchline abandonments proliferate around the country, Federal assistance for branchline operations has been zeroed out of the President's budget request. Thus, the equity question which arises is one among producers versus carriers versus consumers. Amtrak represents an investment by all taxpayers; therefore, the Committee feels that a national passenger system is the equitable extension of that investment.

Deregulation.—The new orientation of Federal transportation policy seems to be based on the perception that public interest and private profit are wholly consistent, and that decentralized private decisionmaking will respond equitably to both consumer needs and carrier needs. In regard to motor carrier and bus deregulation implementation, the Committee is concerned about what might be the equity impact on industry and consumers of budget cuts in the agency charged with overseeing that deregulation. Aviation deregulation has resulted in skyrocketing fares and reduced service between most cities, in order to cross-subsidize below-cost fares on cross-country and major-city routes.

Transit.—In transit programs, the Committee is concerned with equity between operating and capital funding, and funds for both rural and urban systems. The President's budget clearly favors capital funding over the operating assistance so vital to rural and urban areas. A large percentage of the users of the section 18 rural transit program are elderly and low-income individuals. The limited transit resources must be spread among existing bus and rail needs, as well as emerging "new start" cities. Again, these are questions of equity.

Federal role.—Another equity question relates to Federal versus State and local responsibility in transportation matters, such as rail safety issues and mass transit assistance. In addition, the percentage of Federal match can strongly influence local decisions. Equitable allocations can be seen to involve considerations of local effort and local versus national benefits.

Ability to pay.—It is problematical whether equity considerations should include ability to pay. For example, whereas most major airports

are in a strong financial position, with relatively easy access to non-Federal capital reinforced by high bond ratings, many small airports earn revenues insufficient to cover debt service and must rely heavily on Federal funding. The question can be raised whether it is more equitable to spend user-fee generated funds where most of the users are, or to apply Federal money toward achieving the greatest benefits that would not otherwise be achieved and enhance the fringe fabric of the overall system. Parallel questions arise in transit and other transportation programs.

Highway user fees.—Congress recently reached what amounts to an equity decision on proportion of the user fees to be paid by users of trucks versus automobile users in the enactment of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act. Those new taxes are now being collected, but the President's budget does not assume the full spending level promised to the beneficiaries during the consideration of that legislation, and the width, weight, and length provisions are being tested in the courts.

Highways and bridges.—The Nation's system of roads and bridges represents an investment in the economy as well as citizen mobility. The recent increase in highway user fees will go a long way toward keeping pace with the deterioration of this system. Although the Committee recognizes that construction to complete the interstate system remains a priority, there continues to be concern about future repair requirements. For example, CBO estimates that more than 11 percent of the Federal-aid highway system roads are in poor condition, with an additional 57 percent identified as being in fair condition. Furthermore, more than 25 percent of the Federal system bridges are identified as in poor-to-fair condition. These figures do not take into consideration repair needs on non-Federal roads, which will continue to plague State and local levels of government. Taken together, these statistics indicate the tremendous responsibility that will remain on the horizon to stem accelerating deterioration of the Nation's highway system. Congress has also taken steps to maximize the economic benefits of our highway investment by increasing truck size and weight limitations. Productivity gains in the trucking industry are critical given the economic situation, and will provide balance for increased use taxes. The Department of Transportation continues to assess this relationship between road use and taxes. The Committee hopes that an equitable proposal regarding user fees will emerge from this analysis.

Hazardous materials.—The movement of hazardous material through the Nation's transportation system poses both a growing challenge as well as an opportunity for cooperation with the States. The Department's prime mission of safety can be adequately met only if every effort is applied toward safer gas and hazardous liquids pipeline programs; careful enforcement of laws governing hazardous material in the air and on the railroads and highways; and vigilance by the Coast Guard over hazards posed on the seas and in ports. Hazardous materials risks must be assessed, intergovernmental roles identified and undertaken, and programs developed which take into highest consideration the public's growing concern in this area. The Committee's funding rec-

ommendations attempt to strike this balance. The Department is directed to work toward innovative technological solutions and to keep the Committee advised of efforts to protect the Nation's citizens and property from hazardous material damage.

Research.—In keeping with its primary mission of safety, the Department's research efforts should place emphasis on such projects as aviation safety; highway safety and crashworthiness of vehicles; and rail system safety. Research efforts must go beyond short-term efforts by reaching for innovative and cost-effective technological advances. The Department's research obligation levels are proposed for a 68-percent increase over fiscal year 1982 levels. This reflects an emphasis in research critical to enhance long-term transportation advances and an improved quality of life for our citizens.

Aviation user fees.—The budget does not reflect the full amount envisioned by the recent authorizations, and the new user fees are adding to the already large balance in the aviation trust fund, which helps reduce the Federal deficit but fails to make a full effort to improve and modernize our airport and airway system.

Foreign competition.—While the Committee believes that American industry can stand toe-to-toe against, and head-and-shoulders higher, in competition with any foreign industry, American industry cannot be expected to compete against foreign governments in the guise of subsidized industry. Policies must be formulated which promote equity in international competition, even if that may require the willingness to impose negative sanctions, where warranted, in counter-action of such sanctions imposed by foreign governments.

Jobs.—Congress earlier this year demonstrated its interest in combining job creation efforts with capital spending needs. The Committee feels that that concern is appropriately reflected in funding for labor intensive highway, transit, and aviation activities. To deny funding initiatives that result in jobs not only jeopardizes the search for equity in transportation allocations, but neglects the human resource aspect of the Nation's infrastructure needs.

Coast Guard.—With the rest of the defense establishment enjoying a real increase in budgetary resources, the Coast Guard, with its multitude of peacetime missions weighing heavily on its resources, must be afforded an equitable share of the defense buildup. Funds appropriated to the Coast Guard truly do double service, as they benefit the public 24-hours every day in peacetime missions (for example; search and rescue, drug interdiction, fisheries patrol, pollution detection and abatement, hijacking interdiction, boating safety, port and waterway security, and aids to navigation) while adding to our ultimate defense capability.

Conclusion.—There can be no substantial growth in national income, no lasting improvement in access to jobs to health care or to recreation, no meaningful increase in productivity, no helpful improvement in our balance of trade, and no long-term improvement in employment, without a strong, steadfast, and certain commitment to the continued improvement in, and equitable allocation of, our transportation investments.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1983	$40,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984	42,537,000
House allowance	41,275,000
Committee recommendation	41,275,000

Establishment of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation is specifically provided for in section 3 of the Department of Transportation Act of October 15, 1966 (Public law 89–670). The Office of the Secretary is composed of her immediate office, the Office of the General Counsel, and four assistant secretarial offices for policy and international affairs, budget and programs, governmental affairs, and administration, respectively. These secretarial offices have "staff" responsibilities consisting of policy development and central supervisory and coordinating functions necessary for the overall planning and direction of the Department of Transportation, including staff assistance and general management supervision of the counterpart offices in the operating administrations of the Department. A Minority Business Resource Center is operated to assist minority business firms in securing contracts on federally-assisted transportation projects. The salaries, administrative expenses, and associated housekeeping costs for these functions are included in the budget request for the Office of the Secretary.

The Committee recommends $41,275,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation. This is the same as the House allowance and $1,262,000 less than the amount of the budget request. The Committee has also restored the limitation on representation expenses to the request level, less $3,000, which is explained in detail under the St. Lawrence Seaway portion of this report.

The Committee believes that a detailed breakout of this appropriation at the office level, as proposed by the House, is unnecessary and inefficient. On a day-to-day basis, the Secretary is in the best position to judge whether resources should be shifted within the salaries and expenses account in order to meet unforeseen problems or to take advantage of opportunities for greater efficiency. If all variances would require prior written approval of the Committees, there would be costly delays in meeting these management challenges. The Committee will expect, however, that any significant variances will be discussed in advance with the Committees.

MINORITY BUSINESS

The Committee is concerned that the Department of Transportation's proposed regulations to implement section 105(f) of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982, Public Law 97–424, fail to recognize the great diversity among recipients of highway and public transportation funding, to which section 105(f) is applicable, and the complex relationships between supporting industries and among companies within those industries. The Committee is also concerned that the proposed regulations provide for less flexibility than the Congress intended and than the statute provided the Secretary when Public Law 97–424 was enacted.

The Committee suggests that the 10-percent participation goal be considered an overall national goal and that the goal established by each individual State should take into consideration such factors as the number of qualified minority contractors available to perform highway work as subcontractors; minority population of the State; and the increased cost impact, if any, of the proposed goal in that State.

The Committee urges that, in both the drafting of the final regulations and the enforcement of their requirements, the Department be mindful of the overriding objectives of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act; namely, the immediate and substantial increase in the level of construction and reconstruction of transportation facilities in this country and job creation. Implementation of the act should be carried out in such a way as to minimize delay and controversy if these objectives are to be attained. Accordingly, the Committee does not consider it appropriate for the Department to withhold Federal-aid funds from a State which is making best faith efforts, consistent with State and Federal law, to provide equal opportunities for firms owned by disadvantaged individuals and women.

CONRAIL SECURITIES

The Committee does not agree with the House language requiring "prior consent" of the Appropriations Committees for any sale of Conrail securities since the 3R Act already provides a mechanism for congressional participation in that process.

DEFENSE RAIL NEEDS

The GAO recently released a study of the Nation's defense rail needs. That study recommended that better procedures be put in place to assure that the strategic rail network is preserved for defense mobilization needs. While the Committee is currently satisfied with DOT's continuation of existing methods of monitoring rail abandonments, it does have two major concerns not directly raised by the GAO study. First, the Committee directs the Secretary to insure that defense mobilization needs are taken into consideration as disposition of Conrail is contemplated. Second, the Secretary should include, in any legislative proposals for the sunset or transfer of the ICC, proposals to insure that rail abandonments affecting the defense rail network (STRACNET) are coordinated with the Department of Defense.

CONSTRUCTION DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY

The House bill contains a general provision (section 315) applicable to the Office of the Secretary which would prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Transportation for promulgation or enforcement of any rule with respect to the repayment of construction differential subsidy for permanent release of vessels from the restrictions in section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. Similar language is included in the House version of the Department of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation bill, 1984 (H.R. 3134).

This matter is the subject of a rulemaking initiated by the Department with a notice published in the Federal Register on January 31, 1983. The Department has received approximately 100 comments on its proposal, from a wide range of interested parties, and is now evaluating those comments, a process which is expected to take several months.

The Committee notes that allowing CDS-built tanker owners to repay subsidies with interest in order to engage in domestic coastwise trade would result in an estimated cash payment of hundreds of millions of dollars to the U.S. Treasury as well as obviating the need for future operating subsidies. In addition, the proposed rulemaking has the potential of reducing the cost of transporting Alaskan crude oil by about one-third ($300,000,000 annually) and introducing more competition.

Thus, the proposed rulemaking clearly has the potential for very significant cost savings to both taxpayers and consumers.

In addition, the House provision is inconsistent with the Senate-passed Maritime Administration Authorization bill, and would circumvent the rulemaking process whereby comments are analyzed and changes to the proposed rule are considered.

The resolution of questions relating to underlying economic analyses, defense mobilization requirements, and cost-benefit considerations is what the formal rulemaking process is designed for, and the Committee is most reluctant to intervene in that process except in the most compelling of circumstances.

Consequently, the Committee has deleted the House provision from the bill.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 1983	$4,900,000
Budget estimate, 1984	7,256,000
House allowance	2,500,000
Committee recommendation	7,256,000

The Office of the Secretary performs those research activities and studies which can more effectively or appropriately be conducted centrally than in the operating administrations. This research effort is concerned with planning, analysis, and information development needed to support the Secretary in the formulation of national transportation policies. The program is carried out primarily through contracts with other Federal agencies, educational institutions, nonprofit research organizations, and private firms, and is included in the budget request for the Office of the Secretary.

The Committee recommends $7,256,000 for transportation planning, research, and development, which is the same as the budget request and $4,756,000 more than the House allowance.

Examples of proposed studies under this program include: returning "nonnational" transportation functions to State and local governments; developing "rigorous cost-benefit standards to insure that only those projects whose benefits exceed their costs are funded"; and eliminating Federal regulatory requirements which restrict competition in transportation industries or "which are not essential to accomplishing national goals."

The amount recommended by the House for TPR&D funding will support only a level of 27 positions, leaving no funds for other uses, in particular contract support. Those other uses include analyses and studies required in major legislation enacted by the Congress over the past 2 years, legislation whose programmatic and regulatory aspects have major effects on the financial and operating status of passenger and freight transportation. For example, the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 (STAA) requires several studies by the Department relating to tax and regulatory provisions. The policy office is also responsible for the conduct of a study, requested by Congress, on airport defederalization. Legislation has been introduced to recover the Government's cost of capital improvements and operations and maintenance of federally-financed transportation facilities and services. Studies which assess the inputs of such changes are essential to their informed consideration by Congress. Funding is also needed to provide backup data for the successful conduct of bilateral negotiations with foreign nations for travel and trade agreements that benefit U.S. industries.

It is for these reasons that the Committee recommends the full amount of the budget request.

Limitation on Working Capital Fund

Limitation, 1983	($70,909,000)
Budget estimate, 1984	(68,198,000)
House allowance	(67,750,000)
Committee recommendation	(68,198,000)

The funds are drawn from appropriations contained elsewhere in this bill and are used to finance central operations such as publishing and graphics, support activities, library services and computer systems. These common services are funded in this manner to promote economy and efficiency.

The bill includes a limitation on the working capital fund of $68,198,000, which is the same as the budget request and $448,000 more than the House allowance.

COAST GUARD

Summary of Fiscal Year 1984 Program

The U.S. Coast Guard, as it is known today, was established on January 28, 1915, through the merger of the Revenue Cutter Service and the Lifesaving Service. This was followed by transfers to the Coast Guard of the U.S. Lighthouse Service in 1939 and the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation in 1942. The Coast Guard has as its primary responsibilities the enforcement of all applicable Federal laws on the high seas and waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, safety of life and property at sea; aiding navigation; and maintaining a state of readiness to function as a specialized service in the Navy in time of war (14 U.S.C. 1, 2).

The Committee recommends a total program level of $2,466,861,000 for the activities of the Coast Guard in fiscal year 1984. The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1983 program level	Fiscal year 1984 budget estimate	Recommended in the House bill	Committee recommendations
Operating expenses	[1] 1,591,403	[2] 1,687,806	[3] 1,687,839	[3] 1,660,806
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	[4] 409,000	378,600	369,000	370,900
Alteration of bridges	12,700	13,200	7,400	12,600
Retired pay	[5] 318,000	341,300	[6] 328,750	[6] 328,750
Reserve training	[7] 54,000	54,805	54,805	54,805
Research, development, test, and evaluation	20,000	22,000	23,500	22,000
National recreational boating safety and facilities improvement fund	[8] 10,000	[9] 15,000	[9] 10,000	[9] 15,000
Other Coast Guard activities	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Total	2,417,103	2,514,711	2,483,294	2,466,861

[1] Includes appropriation for debt reduction and $14,000,000 derived by transfer.
[2] Includes appropriation for debt reduction.
[3] Includes appropriation for debt reduction and $12,550,000 derived by transfer.
[4] Includes $9,000,000 derived by transfer.
[5] Reflects reduction of $18,000,000 in transfers to other accounts of fiscal year 1983 appropriation.
[6] Reflects reduction of $12,550,000 in transfer to operating expenses appropriation.
[7] Includes $4,000,000 derived by transfer.
[8] Includes $5,000,000 of contract authority.
[9] Contract authority obligation ceiling.

OPERATING EXPENSES

	Appropriation	By transfer
Appropriations, 1983	[1] $1,577,403,000	($14,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1984	[1] 1,687,806,000	
House allowance	[1] 1,675,289,000	(12,550,000)
Committee recommendation	[1] 1,648,256,000	(12,550,000)

[1] Includes appropriation for debt reduction.

Through the operating expenses appropriation the Coast Guard employs multi-purpose vessels, aircraft, and shore units, strategically located along the coasts and inland waterways of the United States and in selected areas overseas.

The activities of this appropriation fall into the following categories:

Search and rescue.—The Coast Guard maintains a nationwide system of boats, aircraft, cutters, and rescue coordination centers on 24-hour alert.

Aids to navigation.—A network of manned and unmanned aids to navigation is maintained along our coasts and on our inland waterways and LORAN stations are operated in the United States and abroad to serve the needs of the armed services and marine and air commerce.

Marine safety.—The Coast Guard insures compliance with Federal statutes and regulations pertaining to the merchant marine industry, operates a boat safety standards program, and is responsible for the safety and security of U.S. ports and waterways.

Marine environmental protection.—Under various laws, international agreements, and conventions, the Coast Guard is charged with the prevention of damage to the marine environment.

Enforcement of laws and treaties.—Cutters and aircraft conduct patrols to enforce international agreements and Federal laws on the high seas and waters over which the United States exercises jurisdiction concerning fisheries, drug smuggling, illegal immigration, hijacking/theft of vessels and other unlawful activities.

Ice operations.—Polar ice operations are performed by icebreakers on ice-strengthened cutters in support of Coast Guard programs, and the requirements of other agencies on a fully reimbursable basis. Domestic ice operations are performed on navigable waters of the United States. Also included are certain marine science activities.

Military readiness.—The Coast Guard operates as a service in the Navy in time of war or national emergency at the direction of the President. During peacetime, an effective state of military preparedness is maintained.

Headquarters administration.—The headquarters administration activity provides funding for administrative services at the headquarters location of the Coast Guard, including executive direction; budget planning and policy; command, control, communication, and operations; financial management; legal; engineering; civil rights; and personnel and health services for the Coast Guard.

For Coast Guard operating expenses the bill includes $1,660,806,000, including a transfer of $12,550,000, which is $27,000,000 less than the

budget request. Funding is included for up to 37,645 military and 5,051 civilian positions.

The Committee recommendation includes an offset against fuel cost savings of $3,000,000 for the continued operation by the Coast Guard of vessel traffic services. In making this recommendation, the Committe is not precluding the future transfer of the operation of these services to State or local government entities. The Committee expects the Coast Guard to continue to pursue this option which was proposed by the roles and missions study.

A $27,000,000 reduction below the budget request is included to meet overall fiscal constraints.

The Committee does not agree with the House that a training increase over the budget is necessary, nor that program slippages and military strength shortfalls in 1982 are valid predictors of 1984 requirements. Of the personnel shortfalls, 500 billets provided for the WMEC–270 cutter program were not used in 1982 due to vessel delivery slippages. Severe financial constraints and budget uncertainties in 1982 contributed to the personnel shortfall and reduced tempo of flight operations. These temporary program conditions no longer exist, and the Committee's recommendation is based upon revised helicopter and cutter delivery schedules and realistic operational schedules.

In addition, the Committee believes that computer and management information systems funding is required to operate and maintain computers which are restored in the AC&I appropriation.

The Committee disagrees with the House language urging stronger marine sanitation device enforcement. Compared with the overwhelming problems of untreated industrial and municipal sewage, the Committee is unconvinced that recreational boaters—who often if not usually are afforded no proper holding tank discharge facilities—are such a significant contributor to pollution as to warrant the diversion of Coast Guard resources from more pressing drug interdiction and search-and-rescue priorities. Pending the outcome of the ongoing departmental review, and in view of the Coast Guard's scarce resources, the Committee believes that the current level of effort is adequate.

POLAR ICEBREAKER PROGRAM

The Coast Guard's polar icebreaker program constitutes a tremendous national asset. Aside from vital military considerations in the polar regions, this program also provides a unique resource for giving access to the scientific wealth of those parts of the world. Ongoing activities provide for oceanographic research, defense capabilities and support of early warning stations, a platform for scientific equipment, and rescue capability for commercial or naval vessels.

In 1982, the Office of Management and Budget directed that polar icebreaker operations be made fully reimbursable by the user agencies. Testimony before the Committee clearly shows that this reimbursable program has not been working well:

> Admiral GRACEY. * * * it is no way to run a Navy. You simply cannot manage vessels of the magnitude and sophistication, and involving the gross

investment that these do, and the kind of scheduling we have, on a year-to-year basis. You simply cannot do it.

You need to have the ability to know what the fleet is going to be and to manage and plan your funding for a long range in the future. Frankly, under the full user charge program I do not think that is possible.

The Coast Guard cannot be expected to effectively manage a program when it does not know from day to day which, if any, users will be supporting it. Consequently, the Committee has included language in the bill to capitalize a revolving fund so that the Coast Guard can draw down this "checking account" to manage its resources effectively, and then have the users reimburse the fund later. Periodic recapitalizations will be made if necessary.

SOUTH FLORIDA DRUG AND ILLEGAL IMMIGRANT INTERDICTION PROGRAMS

The Committee concurs with the House in including all necessary funding for the South Florida Drug Enforcement Task Force. the Committee is well pleased that the program has increased the drug interdiction rate. While the rate of interdiction has increased, the Committee notes it is still well below half of the 70 percent interdiction rate established by the Coast Guard as a goal for this program. The Committee, therefore, directs the Coast Guard to continue to explore strategic program changes to further increase the interdiction rate.

The Committee is pleased with the Coast Guard Haitian migrant interdiction operation (HMIO) and notes that since the program began on October 9, 1981, 11 vessels have been intercepted, and 266 Haitians have been returned. The general knowledge in Haiti and other areas of the Caribbean of the HMIO program has had a significant impact in reducing the number of Haitian arrivals in south Florida. The number of actual arrivals is now well below 90 percent of the historical trends. The Committee directs the Coast Guard to continue the program and to expand the program beyond the Windward Passage to all Coast Guard cutters patrolling the waters off of south Florida.

CHILD AND SPOUSE ABUSE

In fiscal year 1983, Congress appropriated $500,000 to be used by the Coast Guard to reduce the incidence of child and spouse abuse among its personnel. During the hearings on the fiscal year 1984 Coast Guard appropriations, the Committee noted the progress that the Coast Guard has made in the development of a family advocacy program. The Committee considers it essential that this important effort continue to move forward. The Committee also believes that emphasis should be placed at the field unit level. Personnel whose primary function is educating and counseling Coast Guard families should be assigned to each major Coast Guard center. These individuals should maintain a close working relationship with appropriate State, local, and DOD officials involved in similar work. The Committee recommends that consideration be given to providing $500,000 to support 15 personnel to function in this capacity within available funds and personnel limits.

BUDGET PRESENTATION

The Committee directs the Coast Guard to develop a more detailed format to justify its operating expenses appropriation request for 1985. It should present and explain the composition of the base operating costs of the various shore, electronic, vessel, and aircraft facilities. This information would be in addition to the present format justifying year-to-year changes. The Committee also requests that supplementary justification materials for the operating expenses "support programs" of the Coast Guard be submitted with the 1985 budget justification.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

Appropriations, 1983	$400,000,000
(By transfer)	(9,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1984	378,600,000
House allowance	369,000,000
Committee recommendation	370,900,000

This appropriation provides for the major acquisition, construction, and improvement of vessels, aircraft, shore units, and aids to navigation operated and maintained by the Coast Guard. Currently, the Coast Guard has in operation approximately 250 cutters, ranging in size from 65-foot tugs to 399-foot polar icebreakers, more than 2,000 boats, more than 150 helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft, approximately 600 stations, centers, and other shore units, some 48,000 navigational aids, and more than 35 radio navigational stations.

For acquisition, construction, and improvements, the bill includes $370,900,000, which is $7,700,000 less than the budget request and $1,900,000 more than the House allowance.

The Committee does not concur with the House addition of $6,500,000 for the Philadelphia marine safety office, and recommends instead $1,400,000 for site preparation. The recommended level also includes restoration of $7,000,000 of the $9,000,000 requested automated data processing expansion. Deferral of this project would result in significant delays in important and urgently needed management improvement initiatives, most notably those associated with implementation of a new standard automated accounting system.

DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM

The Committee continues to support efforts to improve the Coast Guard's capability to participate in the national narcotics border interdiction system. This program, as described in previous Committee reports, seeks to maintain pressure on principal smuggling routes through "choke points," but the capability to detect and interdict shipments which avoid traditional routes needs to be improved. Such improvements would also enhance all of the other Coast Guard program elements.

The Committee strongly supports Coast Guard plans to begin renovation and modernization (FRAM) of the entire 378-foot high endurance cutter fleet over the next 5 years as scheduled in the capital investment plan. In addition to their national defense and search and

22-774 O - 83 - 2

rescue roles, these cutters have become major assets in the maritime drug interdiction program and these vital roles will be enhanced through modernization of the cutter equipment. The Committee specifically supports plans to award multiyear contracts to complete the FRAM at commercial shipyards and thereby gain the significant advantages of lower costs and equipment standardization.

The Committee is encouraged by preliminary reports regarding the AIREYE's effectiveness, to collect and process a large amount of vessel traffic data and to monitor large areas of ocean, both day and night. The system will greatly increase the Coast Guard's drug interdiction capabilities by enabling aircraft equipped with AIREYE to cover in 8 minutes an area which now requires a 2-hour patrol. The Committee notes that the Coast Guard does not currently have plans to procure more than the initial six systems even though only 1 of the 12 patrol aircraft in the 7th District—the focus of the illegal drug trade—will be AIREYE equipped.

Although the Committee had hoped to include additional funds for airborne surveillance, fiscal constraints require that this initiative be postponed.

PATROL BOATS FOR CARIBBEAN OPERATIONS

The Committee notes that it has been over a year since the Department indicated the availability of funds for six patrol boats for Caribbean operations. In spite of repeated urgings from the Committee that the procurement of these vessels is a matter of urgency because of their need to assist in the interdiction of illegal drugs, the agency is still only in midstream of the procurement process. The procurement process for these vessels has been twice aborted, once to change from a two-step procurement to a negotiated procurement method and then from a general advertisement to a small business set-aside. The Committee directs that the highest Coast Guard attention be given to this procurement to insure it advances to the earliest possible successful conclusion without further delay.

ALTERATION OF BRIDGES

Appropriations, 1983	$12,700,000
Budget estimate, 1984	13,200,000
House allowance	7,400,000
Committee recommendation	12,600,000

The alteration of bridges appropriation provides funds for the Coast Guard's share of the cost of altering or removing bridges obstructive to navigation. Under the provisions of the Truman-Hobbs Act of June 21, 1940, as amended, (33 U.S.C. 511 et seq.) the Coast Guard, as the Federal Government's agent, is required to share with owners the cost of altering railroad and publicly owned highway bridges which obstruct the free movement of navigation on navigable waters of the United States in accordance with the formula established in 33 U.S.C. 516.

The bill includes $12,600,000 for alteration of bridges, which is $600,000 less than the budget request and $5,200,000 more than the House allowance.

The costs of the bridges for which funds are recommended are included in the following table:

Bridge/owner	Previously funded	Budget request	Recommended in the House bill	Committee recommendation's
Point Pleasant Canal, Point Pleasant, N.J. (New Jersey DOT Highway 88)	$9,900,000	$3,200,000		
Willamette River, Portland, Oreg. (Burlington Northern RR)	1,800,000			$5,200,000
Illinois River, Peoria, Ill. (Peoria & Pekin Union RR)	6,600,000	10,000,000	$7,400,000	7,400,000
Total	18,300,000	13,200,000	7,400,000	12,600,000

Retired Pay

Appropriations, 1983	$336,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984	341,300,000
House allowance	341,300,000
Committee recommendation	341,300,000

The retired pay appropriation provides for retired pay of military personnel of the Coast Guard and Coast Guard Reserve, members of the former Lighthouse Service, and for annuities payable to beneficiaries of retired military personnel under the retired serviceman's family protection plan (10 U.S.C. 1431–1446) and survivor benefit plan (10 U.S.C. 1447–1455), and for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under the Dependents Medical Care Act. The average number of personnel on the retired rolls is estimated to be 24,191 in fiscal year 1984, as compared with an estimated 23,298 in fiscal year 1983 and 22,517 in fiscal year 1982.

The bill includes $341,300,000 for retired pay and medical care costs, which is the same as the House allowance.

Reserve Training

Appropriations, 1983	$50,000,000
(By transfer)	(4,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1984	54,805,000
House allowance	54,805,000
Committee recommendation	54,805,000

The Coast Guard Reserve was established by Act of Congress in February 1941, to provide qualified individuals and trained units for active duty in time of war or national emergency. This objective is now being accomplished through formal training and augmentation of regular forces in the performance of peacetime missions during domestic emergencies and during routine and peak operations. The program activities fall into the following categories.

Initial training.—This activity consists of initial training for three categories of nonprior service trainees.

Continuing training.—This activity includes the training of officer and enlisted personnel through the performance of drills and annual active duty training.

Operation and maintenance of training facilities.—This activity consists of the day-to-day operation and maintenance of Reserve training facilities, including organized Reserve training units.

Administration.—This activity provides all administrative functions required in the operation of the Reserve Forces program.

The bill includes $54,805,000 for reserve training, which is the same as the budget request and the House allowance. The increase of $805,000 over fiscal year 1983 will support a ready reserve of 18,500, including a selected reserve of 12,000.

Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

Appropriations, 1983	$20,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984	22,000,000
House allowance	23,500,000
Committee recommendation	22,000,000

The Coast Guard's research and development program seeks to maintain and expand the technological base in areas crucial to the successful execution of the Coast Guard's operational and regulatory missions. This appropriation will allow the Coast Guard to continue its research and development in the areas of commercial vessel safety, marine environmental protection, aids to navigation, and advanced technology vessels. Increased emphasis will be devoted to search and rescue. The Committee has also provided funds for 85 military and 110 civilian positions under this appropriation.

The bill includes $22,000,000 for research, development, test, and evaluation, which is the same as the budget request and $1,500,000 less than the House allowance.

The requested and approved program distribution is as follows:

Program	*Amount*
Search and rescue	$3,000,000
Aids to navigation	1,200,000
Commercial vessel safety	1,550,000
Marine environmental protection	3,100,000
Enforcement of laws and treaties	150,000
Advanced marine vehicles	1,700,000
Other multimission research	2,700,000
Administration	8,600,000
Total	22,000,000

Offshore Oil Pollution Compensation Fund

Appropriations, 1983	$1,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984 [1]	1,000,000
House allowance	1,000,000
Committee recommendation [1]	1,000,000

[1] Indefinite appropriation.

Title III of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act amendments of 1978 provides for an oil pollution compensation fund to pay compensation for damages, including cleanup resulting from oil spills as a result of loading, offloading, or transit activities taking place on the Outer Continental Shelf. Receipts are generated from a fee on Outer Continental Shelf oil.

The bill includes an indefinite appropriation, under which the Coast Guard expects obligations to reach $1,000,000, together with the requested authority to borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury to meet fund obligations. In addition, the bill includes the requested general provision which would limit fiscal year 1984 obligations under the fund to a maximum of $60,000,000.

The indefinite language originally proposed by the President allows the budget estimates and comparative statements to show budget authority equal to expected program obligations (in amounts equal to the definite appropriation provided by the House bill), but, in conjunction with the limitation, also allows obligations for an emergency of any balance in the fund, plus borrowing authority, up to the cap (contained in the limitation) without further congressional action.

The House allowance would appropriate a definite amount from the fund, instead of "such sums as may be necessary." This definite appropriation would appear to place a specific cap on total obligations, with no provision for expeditiously treating emergencies, because a supplemental appropriation would appear to be necessary to obligate more than the amount specified. The sentence in the House bill authorizing the use of borrowing authority may operate only to increase the balance in the fund, and may not permit this balance to be obligated except to the extent that cumulative obligations, including obligation of amounts borrowed, do not exceed the amount of the specific appropriation.

Fortunately, there has not been an oil spill emergency. The Committee believes, however, that in establishing this fund, the Congress intended to assure a prompt and flexible response mechanism in anticipation of such an emergency.

Deepwater Port Liability Fund

Appropriations, 1983	$1,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984 [1]	1,000,000
House allowance	1,000,000
Committee recommendation [1]	1,000,000

[1] Indefinite appropriation.

The deepwater port liability fund was established to provide a system for determination and settlement, without fault, of claims for all cleanup costs and damages incurred, but not otherwise compensated, as a

result of discharges of oil into the marine environment from deepwater port activities. (33 U.S.C. 1517(f)).

The Committee recommends an indefinite appropriation for the continued operation of the deepwater port liability fund, under which the Coast Guard expects obligations to reach $1,000,000. The Committee believes that this amount, together with the unobligated balance from prior year appropriations, should provide sufficient obligational authority for fiscal year 1984. The bill also includes the language requested to permit borrowing from the Department of the Treasury and to limit total fund obligations to $50,000,000 in fiscal year 1984.

The indefinite language originally proposed by the President allows the budget estimates and comparative statements to show budget authority equal to expected program obligations (in amounts equal to the definite appropriation provided by the House bill), but, in conjunction with the limitation, also allows obligations for an emergency of any balance in the fund, plus borrowing authority, up to the cap (contained in the limitation) without further congressional action.

The House allowance would appropriate a definite amount from the fund, instead of "such sums as may be necessary." This definite appropriation would appear to place a specific cap on total obligations, with no provision for expeditiously treating emergencies, because a supplemental appropriation would appear to be necessary to obligate more than the amount specified. The sentence in the House bill authorizing the use of borrowing authority may operate only to increase the balance in the fund, and may not permit this balance to be obligated except to the extent that cumulative obligations, including obligation of amounts borrowed, do not exceed the amount of the specific appropriation.

Fortunately, there has not been an oil spill emergency. The Committee believes, however, that in establishing this fund, the Congress intended to assure a prompt and flexible response mechanism in anticipation of such an emergency.

National Recreational Boating Safety and Facilities Improvement Fund

(Liquidation of Contract Authorization)

Appropriations, 1983	.....
Budget estimate, 1984	($15,000,000)
House allowance	(10,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(15,000,000)

This fund provides financial assistance for the development and implementation of a coordinated national recreational boating safety program for the several States, as provided for in the Recreational Boating Safety and Facilities Improvement Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–451, as amended). That act establishes a fund from which the Secretary may allocate and distribute matching funds to assist in the development, administration, and financing of acceptable State programs. The fund consists of amounts transferred into it from the highway trust fund equivalent to the motorboat fuel tax (9 cents per gallon) receipts, but not to

exceed $45,000,000 per year, or $45,000,000 total at any time. Any motorboat fuel tax receipts in excess of $45,000,000 are transferred to the land and water conservation fund created in 1965 (Public Law 88–578).

The Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 changed the program financing to contract authority effective in fiscal year 1983. Consequently, an appropriation to liquidate contract authority is needed. The bill also includes language to limit fiscal year 1984 obligations to $15,000,000, to be used solely for recreational boating safety assistance. This is the same as the budget request and $5,000,000 more than the House allowance.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

Summary of Fiscal Year 1984 Program

The Federal Aviation Administration traces its origins to the Air Commerce Act of 1926, but more recently to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which established the independent Federal Aviation Agency from functions which had resided in the Airways Modernization Board, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and parts of the Civil Aeronautics Board. FAA became an administration of the Department of Transportation on April 1, 1967 pursuant to the Department of Transportation Act (October 15, 1966).

The total recommended program level for the FAA for fiscal year 1984 amounts to $4,420,159,000, including $800,000,000 as an obligation limitation against previously enacted contract authority. The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1983 program level	Fiscal year 1984 budget estimate	Recommended in the House bill	Committee recommendations
Operations and headquarters administration	2,516,357	2,701,598	2,650,200	2,556,900
Facilities and equipment	[1] 625,000	1,000,000	985,500	750,000
Research, engineering, and development	121,255	285,984	278,000	263,452
Grants-in-aid for airports [2]	750,000	700,000	900,000	800,000
Rescission			-143,500	
Metropolitan Washington airports	43,035	49,807	46,307	49,807
Total	4,055,647	4,737,389	4,716,507	4,420,159

[1] Includes $7,450,000 derived by transfer.
[2] Contract authority obligation ceiling.

HEADQUARTERS ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1983	$54,574,000
Budget estimate, 1984	62,076,000
House allowance	56,900,000
Committee recommendation	56,900,000

The Committee recommends a new appropriation of $56,900,000, which is $5,176,000 below the budget request, for the following activities:

Procurement.—Directs the management and procurement of materiel and supply support for air navigation and air traffic control facilities; agency aircraft; and the acquisition, control, and management of real and personal property, building space, public utilities, and other services.

Executive direction.—Establishes policy and broad technological, operational, and managerial concepts. Directs the agency in implementation of policy and execution of established concepts.

Communications control.—Provides key agency officials with effective executive telecommunications.

Public affairs.—Insures that relevant information concerning FAA is consistently presented in a factual, dignified, and timely manner.

Legal.—Provides legal counsel and advice for the handling of all legal matters with which FAA is concerned, in order to insure conformance with all legal requirements of all applicable laws, rules, regulations, and orders.

Planning/policy.—Recommends FAA policy and plans; identifies needed national air system changes; performs economic analysis of regulations.

Accounting.—Provides accounting, financial advisory, and audit liaison services.

Budget.—Identifies and defines budgetary needs and assures that they are effectively presented to the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, Office of Management and Budget, and congressional committees, and that funds and other resources available to the agency are effectively utilized.

Civil rights.—Assures full and affirmative implementation of civil rights and equal opportunity precepts within the Federal Aviation Administration.

International aviation.—Insures adequacy of international aviation system policies, maintains effective liaison with foreign governments.

Personnel management.—Develops, issues, and guides the personnel policies of the FAA.

Labor relations.—Provides advice and assistance on labor relations and employee conduct and discipline programs; administers national labor agreements.

Management systems/data systems.—Develops and administers the implementation and operation of FAA organizational plans, management systems and controls, and administrative standards and proce-dures; provides data processing, editorial, graphics, and publishing services to the Washington headquarters.

Centralized training.—Plans, develops, coordinates, and directs the training of the FAA work force.

The amount recommended, which constitutes an unallocated reduction of $5,176,000, would fund 674 positions, and the Committee has restored last year's bill language providing for 7.5-percent transfer authority in order to avoid any prospect of furloughs which might result from future legislation or other unforeseen developments.

The Committee reiterates the intent of the Fiscal Year 1983 Transportation Appropriations Act prohibiting the Federal Aviation Administration from undertaking any reorganization of its regional office structure without the prior approval of both House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

Pursuant to a GAO report dealing with the management of aircraft by the Federal Aviation Administration, the Congress included a provision in the Fiscal Year 1983 Transportation Appropriations Act designed to eliminate the unnecessary use of FAA aircraft by the Administrator of the FAA. The Committee continues to be concerned that Federal funds be efficiently and effectively utilized and, therefore, has restated the language of last year's legislation. The Committee notes that the FAA has recently submitted a response to the GAO report. The Committee will carefully review this document and work to insure that taxpayers' dollars are prudently spent.

REGIONAL AND AERONAUTICAL CENTER COMPUTERS

The House has denied all funding for lease, maintenance, and purchase of regional computers; directed FAA to implement GAO recommendations regarding the termination of the contract for these computers; stated that FAA ignored the intent of the Committee by purchasing four of the systems; denied purchase funds for the Aeronautical Center's computer; and stated that the FAA has not made a timely response to its requested analysis and plan for comprehensive information requirements.

The Committee agrees that some FAA actions appear to have been taken unilaterally and perhaps unwisely; that the amount of computer capacity acquired is in dispute; and that comprehensive information analysis and long-range plans were not completed in time for fiscal year 1984 budget hearings. However, the Committee understands that a rebuttal has been filed to the GAO decision and that this may lead to some modification of the decision and its accompanying recommendation.

The additional information alleges that the amount of capacity in dispute represents about $450,000 of the $23,000,000 replacement project and that at least $13,000,000 will be unrecoverable if the present contract is terminated. The Committee further recognizes the paramount need for FAA to provide continuity of its safety-related programs and basic agency functions which are dependent on computers.

The FAA has informed the Committee that it is in receipt of a letter from the Comptroller General that requests additional information so that the GAO can reevaluate its previous recommendation. FAA is now

in the process of providing this information to the GAO. In addition, the FAA is in the midst of a comprehensive information resource management planning effort covering the period to the year 2000 and has promised to provide the Congress with copies of the resulting report in September 1983. The Committee, therefore, authorizes the FAA to continue to lease and maintain its existing regional and Aeronautical Center computer systems at requested funding levels pending results of the GAO reevaluation and the satisfaction of congressional concerns. With this in mind, the Committee restores $3,183,000 in the operations appropriation and $4,938,000 in the headquarters administration appropriation. In the event the final decision is to terminate the computer contracts, these funds shall be used to offset costs incurred by the termination. In the interim, FAA is admonished not to expand the number of computers or acquire new systems. In any event, the Committee will look to the cost-benefit aspects of the GAO review to determine the advisability of any change in the regional and center computers.

NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM PLAN

The Committee concurs with the House that the Congress has a continuing responsibility to monitor the implementation of the NAS plan. The Congressional Budet Office review resulted in the following conclusion:

> The weight of technical opinion, and I would think also the weight of passenger opinion, is that we must modernize the Nation's air traffic control infrastructure. The economic question is how and when to do this. Our appraisal indicates that, if fully implemented, the FAA plan offers the Nation a sound economic investment. Indeed, such an investment appears overdue. The cost effectiveness of the plan, however, depends on organizational changes in the FAA, including a consolidation of facilities and a reduction in staff. In the past, such changes have been of great concern to the Congress, the FAA work force, and aviation interests. Failure to follow through with these changes could result in investment costs that exceed benefits to the FAA.

With the cost effectiveness of the plan being so closely dependent upon the decommissioning and consolidation of facilities, the Committee believes the time has come for the FAA to desist from its current policy to propose closures on an ad hoc, piecemeal basis. Taken in isolation, every facility has merit and Congress is apt to reflect this fact by opposing such closures. Not until Congress can review the full breadth and thrust of the "master plan," can it be expected to weigh the program needs of the NAS plan against the relative and competing merits of components of the FAA's facility network.

Consequently, the bill provides that by October 1, 1983, the Department shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed, site-specific, and time-phased plan forany facilities closures or consolidations over the next 3 years. The FAA is directed that no facility closures or consolidations shall take place prior to December 1, 1983, which shall be the target date for congressional response and approval of the plan.

With regard to a question noting that the General Accounting Office's recalculation showed that flight service station automation mifht

actually increase, not decrease, costs to the Government, the FAA provided the following testimony:

> The cost analysis accomplished by the FAA in 1978/79, which determined that automation/consolidation was a cost-effective solution to the FSS dilemma, was a valid analysis based on the operational scenario and technical data pertinent at the time. We are currently fine tuning that analysis to account for the impact of lower projected demand, leased buildings, and revised communications rate structure. Initial results indicate that automation/consolidation remains cost effective.

In view of this very tentative statement, the Committee will expect the Department's October 1 submittal to include complete and detailed cost-effectiveness data.

Provi3ion is also made that, in the instance of any proposed closure, or consolidation questioned by a congressional committee, such proposed action shall be held in abeyance until April 15, 1984, in order to allow for the timely conduct of any necessary congressional hearings.

OPERATIONS

Appropriations, 1983	$2,461,783,000
Budget estimate, 1984	2,639,522,000
House allowance	2,593,300,000
Committee recommendation	2,500,000,000

FAA's operations appropriation provides funds for the operation, maintenance, communications, and logistic support of the air traffic control and navigation systems and activities. It also covers the administration and management of the airports, medical and engineering and development programs. The activities of the operations accounts comprise seven main areas:

Operation of air traffic control system.—The operathon of a national system of air traffic management in the United States and its possessions on a 24-hour basis.

Installation and materiel services.—Procurement, contracting, and materiel EAnagement programs.

Maintenance of traffic control system.—The direction and engineering services related to the maintenance, improvement, and modification of facilities and equipment in the traffic control system.

Administration of aviation standards program.—This activity exists to promote flight safety of commercial civil aircraft by assuring the airworthiness of aircraft; the competence of pilots, avia4ors, and aviator technicians; the adequacy of flight procedures and air operations; and to conduct the civil aviation security program.

Administration of medical programs.—The development of regulations governing the physical and mental fitness of pilots and other persons wjose health affects safety in flight; the application of these medical standards.

Development direction.—The planning, direction, and evaluation of the engineering and development program, direct project costs of which are financed under the research, engineering, and development approprkation.

Administration of airports program—Administration of airport grants and the qafety certification of airports.

The bill includes a total of $2,500,000,000 for the operations activities of the Federal Aviation Administration. This is $139,522,000 less than the budget request, $93,300,000 less than the House allowance, and includes no funds to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

USE OF TRUST FUND FOR OPERATIONS

Of the entire amount of this appropriation, no funds are to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund. It is entirely unreasonable and inappropriate for the users of the system not to share in the costs. This is required, however, by the terms of the existing authorizing legislation which related this cost,sharing amount to funding for certain other trust fund financed programs.

The Committee questions the soundness of specifying that the Congress appropriate currently unneeded or lower priority funds for FAA facilities and equipmdnt in order to insure a reasonably appropriate cost sharing by the airport and airways users. This so-called penalty clause only penalizes general taxpayers, many of whom seldom, if ever, fly. The Committee concurs with the House suggestion that the FAA submit legislation to the appropriate authorizing committees to modify thas apparent anomaly. If this situation is allowed to continue, resulting in ever-burgeoning balances in the trust fun, it will be only a matter of time before the trust fund is abolished with all ucr revenues accruing to the general fund.

PROGRAM REDUCTIONS

The Committee concurs with the program reductions'recommended by the House, and has reduced the program level by an additional $93,000,000 due6po overall fiscal constraints. Included in the reduction is the deletion of funds requested to reimburse the Department of Commerce for weather services. A corresponding increase has been recommended for this program in the fiscal year 1984 appropriation bill for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies (H.R. 3134).

RECOMMENDED STAFFING

The Committee has been tracking the temporapy, emergency closures of flight service stations which have been attributable to insufficent backup personnel to continue full-time staffing in events such as employee illness, retirement, and vacation leave. Because of the crucially important functhons of flight service stations for most elements of aviation, the FAA should consider increasing the number of FSS personnel beyond 4,500. If this cannot be done within available funds, the FAA should so advise the Congress so that at can consider supplemental appropriations.

The Committee notes that the FAA's operational inspection work force suffered a 10-percent reductio. in 1983. Before that reduction

there were only 410 air carrier operations inspecto2s and 285 maintenance inspectors to cover 463 air carriers and commuters. With recent aviation tragedies highlighting the importance of proper maintenance and operations procedures (Eastern's L–1011, Republic's DC–9, et cetera), the Committee strongly urges the FAA to conduct a comprehensive analysis to insure that staffing either is, or is made to be, adequate to meet the nmeds in light of these events. In this regard, the FAA shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, not later than November 1, 1983, a history and analysis of staffing and grade levels in the operational inspection—air carrier work force along with recommendations.

In any event, the staffing level recommended by the House shall be considered as the absolute overall minimum, subject to selective upward adjustment.

FLIGHT SERVICE STATIONS

The Committee has taken note of the following recent findings and recommendations pertaining to flight service stations:

NTSB special investigation report "Followup Study of the United States Air Traffic Control System; (NTSB/SIR–83/01) of May 12, 1983—Conclusions:

> "Nonscheduled users of the ATC system are experiencing difficulties in using the ATC system, particularly in obtaining the services of flight service stations.
>
> "Many pilots are flying under visual flight rules, instead of in the ATC system-controlled environment, because of the inability to communicate with, or difficulty in communicating with, flight service stations.
>
> "Many pilots cannot obtain timely weather briefings from flight service stations because the telephone lines to the facilities are too busy during inclement weather.
>
> "Flight service stations generally are not providing adequate services to users because of the inadequate staffing, outdated equipment, and the additional workload and part-time operation since the controllers' strike.
>
> "The closure or part-time operation of flight service stations and control towers causes increased operational and safety-related problems for some ATC system users."

GAO report "FAA's Plan to Improve the Air Traffic Control System: A Step in the Right Direction but Improvements and Better Coordination are Needed" (GAO/AFMD–83–34 February 16, 1983):

> "We believe previous cost-benefit analyses were deficient, in part because they did not use sensitivity analysis; that is, they did not consider a range of factors. In addition, our detailed analysis and subsequent recalculation of costs and benefits disclosed some highly questionable adjustments without which the project would not have been justified by FAA's analysis (page 9).

"Assess and resolve promptly the identified critical communication issues. This should include: Reassessment of costs and benefits to flight service station automation project users so that a decision can be made about implementing the program (page 10).

"FAA should assess the degree of acceptance among general aviation pilots of the automated flight services it plans to offer. The success of the program and its cost impact on the Government depend on such acceptance.

Those planned automated services will require pilots to use either computer terminals with ordinary telephone lines or touch-tone telephones. A direct user access terminal costs a few hundred dollars. Using a touch-tone telephone, approximately 100 keystrokes are required to enter flight plans. FAA has not evaluated pilot willingness to purchase terminals or enter a flight plan with a touch-tone telephone, but estimates that by 1995, 80 percent of weather briefings and 85 percent of flight plans will be filed directly by pilots without the assistance of flight service specialists.

"A comparison of our recalculated costs for both the present system and the flight service station system shows that the latter offers no cost advantage to the Government (page 61).

"We recommend that the Secretary of Transportation direct the FAA Administrator to: Assess and resolve promptly the identified critical communication issues. This should include: Reassessment of costs and benefits to flight service station automation project users so that a decision can be made about implementing the program (page 61)."

President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control—Task Force Report on the Department of Transportation (May 2, 1983):

"FAA has not presented a comprehensive, convincing plan for consolidation that would encourage rational analysis of the pros and cons (page 236)."

In consideration of such overwhelming concern from informed investigations, the Committee directs the Secretary to review and comprehensively analyze the flight service station programs and submit a detailed report with findings and conclusions to the appropriate committees of Congress no later than November 1, 1983.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLER STAFFING

In its report, the House urges FAA to consider the reinstatement of certain air traffic controllers previously dismissed for illegally striking against the Government of the United States. The Committee has reviewed the House recommendation carefully and concluded that this action would be a serious mistake that could result in grave consequences.

The Committee opposes the House recommendation on several points. First, it is inconsistent with an expressed determination of the President that controllers terminated for striking may not be reemployed by the FAA. Second, since the illegal controllers' strike, the FAA has made tremendous gains in rebuilding the air traffic system.

Each major goal and milestone has been met or exceeded. This has been possible, in large part, to the dedication of the controllers who honored their oaths of office and stayed on the job along with the extra effort put forth by the FAA's supervisory workforce. Finally, it is clear, and indeed was confirmed in the special survey commissioned by the House Public Works and Transportation Committee's Subcommittee on Investigation and Oversight, that FAA's working controllers oppose the reinstatement of those terminated for striking. In fact, it is FAA's firm belief that rehiring such controllers would be extremely disruptive to the air traffic system.

In conclusion, the House recommendation would be a severe blow to the morale of controllers who stayed on the job and worked diligently and efficiently during the rebuilding period. Accordingly, the Committee disagrees with the recommendation concerning the reinstatement of terminated controllers.

ACADEMY INSTRUCTORS

The bill includes a technical provision concerning the pay raise for certain FAA Academy instructors in Oklahoma City.

Included in the continuing resolution passed late last year, was language providing the same pay raise to certain Academy instructors who were training employees that would be eligible for the increased pay when they report to their positions in the field. But for the fact that these instructors were at the Academy, they would also have been receiving the increased pay in the field. The pay raise for the Academy instructors was not explicitly made retroactive to August 1981, as it was for the field employees, although congressional intent was clear that Academy instructors were to be treated fairly and equally, including having the pay raise apply retroactively. The recommended bill language clarifies that intent.

RESTRICTED CATEGORY AIRCRAFT

The Committee joins the House in directing the FAA to investigate the use of aircraft which are operating with restricted airworthiness certificates and are not, in fact, being operated by the owner of the aircraft, but, instead, are leased to a person who then carries either cargo or his own property. This type of operation appears to be at variance with FAR 91.39, and the Committee urges the FAA to assure that only those who actually own the aircraft may use it for the carriage of their own property. In addition, the Committee directs the FAA to prevent operators of restricted aircraft from violating the intent of the regulations by purchasing the property and then reselling it at the destination point. Finally, the Committee believes the FAA should deny any future applications for the use of restricted aircraft for the carriage of cargo if it is determined that aircraft with standard airworthiness certificates are available.

USE OF ILLEGAL DRUGS

The Committee has received numerous letters and telephone inquiries concerning the possible use of illegal drugs, not only by air traffic controllers, but by pilots and others associated with aviation as well. The FAA believes that drug use by controllers does not constitute a serious problem and that from toxicological studies conducted on victims of aircraft accidents, drug usage appears to play a minor role in causing accidents. Although the FAA has not identified a significant aviation-related drug problem, the Committee continues to have concern regarding this matter. The Committee, therefore, directs the FAA to continue to closely monitor this potential problem and keep the appropriate committees informed of its findings so that the Congress can determine the need for action on its part. The FAA should be prepared to respond with specific detail on incidents, allegations, and actions it has taken to appropriate congressional committees and the General Accounting Office.

PENDLETON, OREG., TOWER

The FAA is directed to give priority consideration to exploring every possibility of reopening the air traffic control tower at Pendleton, Oreg. If reopening the tower under FAA control is not possible, the FAA is directed to reopen the tower under the private contract employee's program. The city has been seeking, unsuccessfully, to reopen the tower since the illegal air traffic controllers' strike. The Committee believes that factors other than the number of operations should be considered by the FAA, such as the fact that the tower is critical to managing air safety in the area due to the intersecting nature of the runways, conflicting air space, and the various segments of aviation that utilize the runways.

WINDSHEAR

The Committee has previously directed the FAA to establish a study at the National Academy of Sciences to determine the state of knowledge, alternative approaches, and the consequences of windshear alert and severe weather condition standards relating to takeoff and landing clearances for commercial and general aviation aircraft, and to double the number of windshear sensors at Moisant Airport in New Orleans, La.

In providing the Committee with a written update of its progress in this regard, the FAA noted that while the additional sensor cost falls within the $150,000 referenced in the Fiscal Year 1983 Appropriations Act, the agency estimates that the total program cost would be approximately $500,000.

The Committee will expect the FAA to use whatever available funds are necessary to accord windshear problems the high-priority attention which they warrant.

AIRCRAFT FIRE SAFETY

Since 1964 the NTSB (and its CAB predecessor) has made a number of recommendations to the FAA on the subject of aircraft fire safety in the following areas: Containment of fuel in a crash and minimizing the ignition of the fuel; improved crashworthiness of fuel systems; better means to prevent, detect, and control inflight fires; more stringent criteria for the flammability of cabin materials. Related survivability recommendations include improvement of crashworthiness of the structure and seats; improved emergency lights; better instructions to passengers; improvements in the training of cabin crews, and more reliable evacuation systems.

The following table is indicative of the magnitude of the problem:

22-774 O - 83 - 3

INFLIGHT FIRE ACCIDENTS

Date	Location	Airplane make and model	Operator	Location of fire	Total on board	Fatalities	Non-fatalities
			U.S. air carriers—1964–83[1]				
July 9, 1964	Parrottsville, Tenn.	Viscount	United Air Lines	Cabin	39	39	0
February 16, 1972	Beaumont, Tex.	Convair 600	Texas Int'l. Airlines	Engine	3	0	3
March 19, 1972	Hill AFB, Utah	Lockheed 188	Universal Airlines	Engine	3	0	3
August 8, 1973	Washington, D.C.	Boeing 727	Braniff Airways	Brakes/wheel well	81	0	81
November 3, 1973	Boston, Mass.	Boeing 707	Pan American[2]	Cabin	3	3	0
February 16, 1974	Herndon, Va.	Boeing 707	Trans World Airlines	Galley (coffee pot explosion)	52	0	52
June 1, 1976	Salina, Kans.	Lockheed L-1011	Trans World Airlines	Electrical system	4	0	4
March 11, 1978	Fort Myers, Fla.	Lockheed 188C	Trans-Int'l. Airlines	Brakes/wheel well	8	0	8
November 24, 1979	Freeport, Bahamas	Convair 440	Mackey International	Engine	46	0	46
February 16, 1982	King Salmon, Ark.	YS-11	Reeve Aleutian Airways	Engine	39	0	39
			Non-U.S. air carriers (U.S. accredited representative participated in the investigation)				
July 11, 1973	Paris, France	Boeing 707	Varig	Rear lavatory	134	123	11
August 19, 1980	Riyadh, Saudi Arabia	Lockheed L-1011	Saudi Airlines	C-3 cargo compt.	301	301	0
June 2, 1983	Cincinnati, Ohio	Douglas DC-9-32	Air Canada	Aft lavatory	46	23	23

[1] Preliminary data through June 14, 1983.
[2] Cargo operation.

The Committee is concerned that, despite considerable rhetoric and research, the FAA has only recently begun to move toward any significant improvements in fire safety. The Committee believes that the state of the art, while not totally adequate, is sufficient for the FAA to move more quickly toward requiring improved fire resistant cabin windows, fire-blocking material over seat cushions, and improved emergency lights. The Committee urges the FAA to expedite its rulemaking.

FLIGHT RECORDERS

Flight data recorders (FDR's) and cockpit voice recorders (CVR's) have been required equipment on large air carrier planes since 1957 and 1966, respectively. Although information from these instruments has often been essential in determining the probable cause of airplane accidents, there is much room for improvement in the quality and capacity of flight recorders and in the Federal regulations that govern their required use. Some CVR's permitted by the regulations have poor performance histories, seriously degrading their value as accident investigation aids. Foil FDR's are still in use, limiting the data available for analysis after an accident.

Fifteen years before the Pan American crash in Kenner, La., in July 1982, the National Transportation Safety Board had urged that all voice recorders of that model be inspected to make sure they were producing usable tapes. And in 1974 the Board had recommended to the FAA that it take action to insure replacement of the old foil recorders more quickly than by attrition.

Within a week of the Pan Am crash, the Board issued six recommendations to the FAA. The first two called for a spot check of the CVR model used in the Pan Am 727 to insure their proper operation and their replacement with more modern recorders within 2 years. Four other recommendations called on the FAA to require all new airline jets to be equipped with modern, digital, expanded-parameter flight data recorders and to set a timetable for retrofitting older airliners.

Response to these recommendations has been disappointing. With regard to the poor quality CVR's, the FAA said that the problem had been addressed through additional maintenance instructions; however, the maintenance bulletins in question are used only at the discretion of the airlines and the Board believes this solution will not remedy the CVR problem. The FAA has evaluated most of the recommendations for improving FDR systems and has said it will initiate rulemaking to implement parts of them.

In addition to these problems, the use of recorders should be expanded. For example, recorders are needed in air transport helicopters. Multiengine, turbine-powered, general aviation aircraft should be equipped with small, lightweight recorders. The Safety Board has been urging the FAA to move forward in these areas since 1973, when the Board called for upgraded recorders in air carrier aircraft. In 1978, the Board called for the development and installation of FDR's and CVR's on general aviation aircraft and, in the interim, the installation of basic CVR's on two-pilot, turbine-powered aircraft used to carry six or more

passengers. The FAA has declined to require interim CVR's in this case (the recommendation was closed by the Safety Board as unacceptable action in August 1982), but has asked the Society of Automotive Engineers to draft a standard for general aviation flight recorders.

In May 1983, the FAA said that it will commence rulemaking to require CVR's, but not FDR's, on part 135 aircraft; and no recorders would be required on aircraft operating under parts 91 and 125.

The Committee urges the FAA to review its policy in regard to these Safety Board recommendations to be sure it is making the greatest possible effort in the interest of the traveling public.

MORGANTOWN FSS

The flight service station at the Morgantown Municipal Airport has been reduced from 24-hour service to a part-time station. This airport serves West Virginia University Hospital, which is a regional emergency treatment center for the critically ill or injured. Because time is a primary factor in the treatment of the critically ill, many are flown into the Morgantown Municipal Airport. Under certain conditions, aircraft have not been able to land because of lack of weather information, thus further threatening the life of the individual because of the delay in emergency treatment. Therefore, the Federal Aviation Administration is directed to staff the flight service station at the Morgantown Municipal Airport on a 24-hour basis.

BUDGET PRESENTATION

The Committee directs the Federal Aviation Administration to develop a more detailed format for justifying the 1985 operations appropriation request. The subactivity narratives should focus on the nature of the base costs incurred in carrying out the specific program and activities of the subactivity. In addition, a format similar to the Coast Guard operating expenses should be used to detail and justify year-to-year changes in the FAA operations appropriation. Not later than November 1, 1983, the FAA shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a draft format for their review and approval.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT (AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1983	$617,550,000
(By transfer)	(7,450,000)
Budget estimate, 1984	1,000,000,000
House allowance	985,500,000
Committee recommendation	750,000,000

Under the facilities and equipment appropriation, safety, capacity and efficiency of the Federal airway system are improved by the installation of new equipment and the construction and modernization of facilities to keep pace with aeronautical activity. In accord with the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, this appropriation now includes programs supporting facilities heretofore financed with general funds under a facilities, engineering, and development appropriation.

The bill includes $750,000,000 for the facilities and equipment of the Federal Aviation Administration. This is $235,500,000 less than the House amount and $125,000,000 more than the fiscal year 1983 level. The recommended, but nonmandatory, program breakdown follows:

	Fiscal year 1983 appropriation	Fiscal year 1984 budget estimate	House level	Committee recommendation
Air route traffic control centers	$86,731,900	$174,602,800	$174,602,800	$125,000,000
Airport towers and terminal equipment	168,277,600	474,012,600	474,012,600	365,000,000
Flight service stations	115,805,100	157,784,000	158,784,000	120,000,000
Air navigation facilities	114,705,100	85,324,100	85,324,100	70,000,000
Miscellaneous facilities	33,926,700	57,462,500	53,462,500	45,000,000
Aircraft and related equipment	82,853,600	24,400,000	24,400,000	10,000,000
Development, test, and evaluation	22,700,000	25,414,000	14,914,000	15,000,000
Total	[1]625,000,000	1,000,000,000	985,500,000	750,000,000

[1] Includes $7,450,000 derived by transfer

The Committee questions whether the FAA can effectively manage a program with the requested magnitude of increase in just 1 year. Indeed, the President's budget appendix shows that this account already has an unobligated balance of $725,236,000 and projects an unobligated balance of $922,236,000 by the end of fiscal year 1984. Faced with stringent overall fiscal restraints, the Committee has no choice but to make reductions where they will have the least negative program impact.

In rebalancing its program to this overall level, the FAA shall insure that no activities having a near-term safety impact shall be reduced or curtailed, and if it becomes evident that safety will be impacted by the overall level, the FAA shall immediately so inform the appropriate committees of the Congress. In the event the FAA is able to accelerate its obligation levels in the course of the fiscal year, it shall so advise the appropriate committees of the Congress so that supplemental appropriations can be considered.

The Committee intends that the FAA use available funds to establish instrument landing systems at the University-Oxford Airport, Miss.; at Farmingdale Airport, New Mexico; and at LaGrange-Calloway Airport in Georgia.

In the Senate report (S. Rept. 97–253) which accompanied the fiscal year 1982 bill, the Committee requested that installation of the nondirectional radio beacon equipment at the Nogales International Airport (Ariz.) be completed at an estimated cost of $16,000. This system when completed will provide navigational assistance to pilots and will transmit weather forecast information within a 100-mile radius. The Committee's directive on this matter was ignored and no communication has been received by the Committee since this language first appeared almost 2 years ago. The Committee directs that the Federal Aviation Administration take immediate action to install the nondirectional radio beacon at Nogales International Airport. Delay in this matter has already resulted in additional costs, and further delay will not be tolerated. The FAA can expect swift and decisive action if it continues to "stonewall" this directive of Congress.

Research, Engineering, and Development

(Airport and Airway Trust Fund)

Appropriations, 1983[1]	$171,755,000
Budget estimate, 1984	285,984,000
House allowance	278,000,000
Committee recommendation	263,452,000

[1] Includes $14,755,000 appropriated under "Facilities, engineering, and development."

This appropriation finances from the trust fund the research, engineering, and development programs to improve the national air traffic control system and to increase its safety, productivity, and capacity. In accord with the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, this appropriation now includes programs supporting safety regulation heretofore financed with general funds under a facilities, engineering, and development appropriation. The programs are designed to meet the expected air traffic demands of the future and promote flight safety. The major objectives are to keep the current system operating safely and efficiently; to protect the environment; to modernize the system through improvements in facilities, equipment, techniques, and procedures in order to insure that the system will safely and efficiently handle the volume of aircraft traffic expected to materialize in the future.

The bill includes $263,452,000 for research, engineering, and development, with the suggested allocation as follows:

	Fiscal year 1983 appropriation	Fiscal year 1984 budget estimate	House level	Committee recommendation
Air route traffic control	$49,230,000	$77,672,000	$76,000,000	$67,000,000
Advanced computer	39,500,000	156,641,000	156,641,000	150,000,000
Navigation	4,952,000	11,009,000	10,500,000	8,000,000
Aviation weather	8,068,000	14,330,000	14,330,000	14,330,000
Aviation medicine	3,060,000	6,101,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
Aircraft regulations and aviation security	11,445,000	17,793,000	14,200,000	17,793,000
Environment	1,500,000	2,438,000	1,929,000	1,929,00
Total	[1] 117,755,000	285,984,000	278,000,000	263,452,000

[1] Includes $14,755,000 appropriated under the heading "Facilities, engineering and development."

Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Liquidation of Contract Authorization)

(Airport and Airway Trust Fund)

Appropriations, 1983	($234,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1984	(745,000,000)
House allowance	(745,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(745,000,000)

The Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, as amended, authorizes a program of grants of funds for airport planning, noise abatment planning, and development grants for public use airports in all States and territories.

The Committee has approved the full budget request of $745,000,000 in liquidating cash for grants-in-aid for airports. This is $511,000,000 more than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1983, and the same as the House allowance.

LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS

The bill also includes a limitation on obligations for airport development and planning grants which are financed under contract authority. The limitation recommended for fiscal year 1984 is $800,000,000. This is $100,000,000 more than the budget request, $100,000,000 less than the House allowance, and $50,000,000 more than the fiscal year 1983 level as augmented by the special jobs bill.

Within the obligation level recommended, the Committee directs that priority be given to grant applications involving the further development of the following airports:

Houston Intercontinental Airport, Tex.;
Aurora Airport, Ill.;
Newport Municipal Airport, Oreg.;
Devils Lake Airport, N. Dak.;
Greater Pittsburgh International Airport, Pa.;
Elizabethtown Airport, Ky.;
Hollywood-Fort Lauderdale Airport, Fla.;
Fargo Airport, N. Dak.;
St. Paul Downtown Airport, Minn.;
Farmington Airport, N. Mex.;
Waukegan Memorial Airport, Ill.:
Bismarck Airport, N. Dak.;
Fleming-Mason County Airport, Ky.;
Palm Beach Airport, Fla.;
St. Cloud Airport, Minn.;
Buddy Ranch Airport, Medora, N. Dak.;
Fairhope Municipal Airport, Ala.;
Las Vegas Airport, N. Mex.;
Austin Airport, Minn.;
Williston International Airport, N. Dak.;
Jackson County Airport, Miss.;
Harrisburg International Airport, Pa.;
Chandler Airport, Ariz.;
Burlington International Airport, Vt.;
Charleston-East Cooper Airports, S.C.;
Dutch Harbor, Alaska;
Washington County Airport, Pa.;
Sarasota-Bradenton Airport, Fla.;
Evansville-Dress Airport, Ind.;
Baltimore-Washington International Airport, Md.;
Fergus Falls Airport, Minn.;
Milwaukee-Mitchell Field, Wisc.;
MacArthur Airport, Long Island, N.Y.; and
Buffalo Greater International Airport, N.Y.

The Committee is concerned with reports that the FAA has terminated all present and future grants to Westchester County Airport in White Plains, N.Y., and will not reinstate them until the Westchester County Board of Legislators eliminates its current curfew on night flights. The board adopted the curfew, effective October 1981, in response to complaints from nearby residents about airport noise. The curfew bans all flights to and from the airport between midnight and 6:30 a.m.

On May 9, 1983, the FAA brought suit challenging the validity of the curfew. The Committee has no desire to interpose itself in any pending lawsuit and does not express any view on the lawfulness or desirability of the curfew in question. The Committee is concerned, however, with the FAA's May 20 announcement that, in view of the pending litigation, the agency would neither provide further grant assistance to the county nor make any payments under existing grant agreements. The immediate effect of the FAA's action is to prevent payment of $885,000 for a previously approved project to repave a taxiway and to prevent approval of a grant application for $300,000 for the acquisition of a permanent noise monitoring system. The FAA's action will prevent the improvement of a taxiway needed to enhance airport safety by reducing ground congestion and the installation of a noise monitoring system. Such a system would encourage the development of alternative noise control strategies which could potentially resolve the present controversy. In view of this situation, the Committee directs, and the bill provides, that, barring any contrary judicial order, the FAA approve and release funds for eligible airport grant projects at Westchester County Airport.

The Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport terminal project is proposed to correct safety problems and the Committee directs that this project be decided on its own merits and be subject to receive Federal funding as any other eligible project would, without being required to submit to the Secretary of Transportation any noise-related map, program, or plan which is not required of other airports in the airport improvement program.

The Committee urges the FAA to make every effort to provide discretionary funds to the State of Maryland for the expansion of pier D facilities at the Baltimore/Washington International Airport. In urging this action, the Committee notes that the timely provision of these funds is consistent with and supportive of, the existing Metropolitan Washington Airports policy.

The limited availability of discretionary airport improvement program funds makes it incumbent upon the FAA to obligate such funds first to safety projects and then to airport improvement projects that will provide the greatest benefits to the greatest number of users. As demand outstrips runway capacity at many airports, the Committee emphasizes the importance of funding needed new runways at those major air carrier airports where recent FAA Task Force delay studies have shown that annual delay costs attributable to inadequate runway capabilities exceed the cost of construction as calculated by the sponsor, and a

provision has been included to that effect, which reserves $80,000,000 to be available first for this purpose.

The Committee also recommends that priority be given to improvements to the UnAlaska Airport at Dutch Harbor, Alaska, which is the second largest fishing port in the United States. The population of Dutch Harbor is expected to increase six-fold during the next 15 years, and commercial air traffic needs will expand accordingly. At present, the UnAlaska Airport is equipped with a narrow, 3,900 foot gravel runway with no navigational aids, and it is rated only for small propeller aircraft. The improvement project would expand the runway to small jet service capability (B–727, B–737 size).

RESCISSION

The House bill included language to rescind $50,000,000 of fiscal year 1983 and $93,500,000 of fiscal year 1984 contract authority for the airport grant program. The Committee cannot accept this rescission of parts of this multiyear authorization. While restrained by fiscal considerations at the present time, the Committee is reluctant to permanently forego the possibility of fulfilling commitments to user fee payers in future years. The House language has been stricken from the bill.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS

Appropriations, 1983	$31,955,000
Budget estimate, 1984	34,557,000
House allowance	34,557,000
Committee recommendation	34,557,000

Metropolitan Washington Airports operates and maintains Washington National and Dulles International Airports. This appropriation finances maintenance, operations, management, and capital investment costs for equipment and minor facility projects. The operation of these airports is conducted on a business basis with revenues collected from landing fees, concessions, and leases. These revenues are deposited into the general fund of the U.S. Treasury and direct appropriations are made to cover the operating costs and capital investment for both airports. Combined revenues are expected to be $47,488,000 in fiscal year 1984. The combined net operating profit for the airports is estimated to be $14,995,000, consisting of a profit of $14,985,000 at Washington National and a profit of $10,000 at Dulles International. After accounting for $7,163,000 in depreciation and interest expenses, the estimated net profit for the two airports will be $7,831,000.

The Committee recommends $34,557,000 for the operation and maintenance of the Metropolitan Washington Airports, which is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

WASHINGTON AIRPORTS POLICY

Washington National Airport has served as Washington's principal airport since 1941. Although built to accommodate older, slower propeller-driven aircraft, Washington National continues to bear the burden of nearly 70 percent of the region's jet traffic. In 1981, the Depart-

ment of Transportation issued rules designed to reduce noise and congestion at National and to channel future growth away from National and toward Dulles and BWI, airports designed to serve large jet traffic.

One of the main elements of that Metropolitan Washington airports policy is the imposition of a passenger limit, or cap, or 16,000,000 annual passengers at Washington National Airport. The cap is set by Federal regulation and is actually enforced by a cycle of forecasting and slot adjustments spelled out in the regulation setting the cap. A notice of proposed rulemaking (Dock. No. 21955) was issued on April 26, 1983, for public comment which proposes the possibility of lowering the Washington National passenger cap. The alternatives offered in the NPPM are:

a. To lower the cap to 14.8 million annual passengers.

or

b. To set the cap at a level which is forecast by the FAA to occur in the 12-month period April 1985 to April 1986. That forecast would be prepared in January 1985. This alternative makes it clear that in no event would the cap exceed 16 million annual passengers.

The proposed rulemaking also addressed commuter air carrier departures and, separately, announcement was made to allow Boeing 757-type aircraft operations at National.

The National Airport controversy is a complicated and difficult one, which the Committee had hoped would not need to be subjected to further congressional involvement. However, the House included in the bill language which would prevent the implementation of the Secretary's Washington airport policy adjustments. Consequently, the responsibility falls to this Committee to recommend action responding equitably to various competing and legitimate public interests and needs.

After thoughtful review of the many relevant factors, the Committee has reached the following conclusions:

a. The Committee finds that the proposed increased operations by commuter air carriers is not inconsistent with the goal of providing service to smaller communities which have lost, or are losing, air carrier service in the wake of deregulation. The Committee is assured that these efficient short-runway takeoffs will not interfere with existing operations and that the aircraft approved to take off under these conditions are the quietest at the airport. Further, this aspect of the proposed rulemaking serves to offset the carriers' argument that as airline slots are reduced, the airlines might seek to maximize revenues generated by each flight by marketing a greater concentration of direct flights to the large metropolitan areas and an ever-decreasing number to medium and small communities.

The Secretary is urged, however, to take every prudent action available to her to help improve the availability of New York-Washington type shuttle operations out of Dulles and BWI, especially in conjunction with subsection (e) below, so that peak capacity can be efficiently managed and so as to maintain an appropriate number of long- and medium-range routes out of National Airport. This is necessary because National Airport serves as a connecting hub between relatively nearby,

small cities and more distant large areas, and such through-traffic serves the traveling public well while placing minimal if any additional burdens on parking and other ground facilities. Further, given its responsibility to provide funding for Amtrak, the Committee believes it prudent to encourage ridership on Amtrak to Northeast Corridor destinations from downtown Washington.

b. The Committee cannot fault the FAA for its separate approval of B–757 operations at National. The decision should be beneficial to the community because this type of aircraft is one of the quietest air carrier aircraft now available, much more so than the B–727's it is likely to replace. As to the concern that the admission of the B–757 will add to the passenger burden at the airport, the Committee notes that the aircraft is configured to carry only eight more passengers than the stretch-version B–727's it is likely to replace. In addition, the carriage of a (capped) number of passengers on marginally fewer aircraft is consistent with safety goals.

c. Testimony before the Committee provides the following traffic estimates for National and Dulles Airports:

Fiscal year	National	Dulles
1983	13,844,000	2,971,000
1984	14,295,000	3,329,000
1985	14,767,000	3,734,000
1986	15,254,000	4,189,000
1987	15,757,000	4,692,000

Actual traffic levels at National have been as follows:

Fiscal year	*Passengers in millions*
1978	13.9
1979	15.0
1980	14.7
1981	14.3
1982	13.4

Clearly, the proposed policy change would not reduce service at National, but simply open the possibility of capping growth sooner.

The air carriers argue that no artificial stimulation is required to attract traffic to BWI or Dulles, and cite the statistics that BWI handled 21.8 percent more passengers in 1982 than 1981, while Dulles passengers increased by 15.5 percent from March 1982 to March 1983. The Committee is unconvinced by this argument, the essence of which is that since progress is being made, additional progress is not necessary. Furthermore, this argument also ignores the fact that the purposes of the policy include the reduction of noise and congestion at National.

Surely, the key purpose of the Lewis policy was to end growth at National. The 16 million figure in that original policy was based, in part, on projections of traffic in 1983. But traffic growth has been much less than anticipated: the present level is about 13.8 million. As a result, the date the cap on traffic would take effect has been effectively extended by about 4 years. The Secretary's proposal splits the time frame difference with the carriers, giving them an additional 2 years of growth

beyond the period of time contemplated by the Lewis policy. Thus, the carriers still have a 2-year adjustment period to plan their service patterns, just as they had under the Lewis plan.

The Committee does not find this to be unreasonable and wishes to emphasize to the carrier interests that further economic improvement could quickly outdate existing traffic forecasts with the result that, under the second alternative in the rulemaking, the floating cap could end up right back at the 16 million level.

d. The Committee concurs with the carriers in regard to the desirability of a stable operating policy so that airlines know how National fits into their marketing and operating strategies.

Although all capital projects and operating and maintenance requirements for both National and Dulles are provided through congressionally appropriated funds, the carriers emphasize that all of these appropriated moneys are recovered through fees and charges imposed upon airline users of the facilities. Naturally, the airlines are very reluctant to underwrite hundreds of millions of dollars in construction costs at National "if such basic ground rules as how many passengers they can serve are subject to revision with each change of administration of the Department of Transportation."

Short of some sort of contractual arrangement, no administration can be expected to tie the hands of a subsequent administration. This is simply in the nature of government programs, and the responsiveness to the public which is the essence of our system of government.

Yet Federal policy should not fluctuate with every blip in forecasts and the Committee is sensitive to the principles of equity and comity which must underlie the relationship of a Federal department with those it regulates. In this instance, however, the magnitude of the change in forecasts was significant, resulting from a combination of economic conditions, deregulation, and the illegal PATCO strike, among other factors.

It seems to this Committee that reason and equity would suggest that an accord be reached with the air transport industry to squarely address its legitimate concern that there be a stable policy for National, and the Secretary is strongly urged to immediately initiate a dialog leading to such an accord. The Secretary will be expected to work with the air carriers and other effected interests to establish an appropriate mix and number of slots in view of B–757 operations, hub concept requirements, commuter needs, and other considerations discussed under this heading.

It is the explicit direction of this Committee that the Secretary work with all interested parties to promptly—and finally—establish a comprehensive, permanent, and integrated national metropolitan airports plan and policy.

e. The Committee believes that the House missed the mark in its attempt to scuttle a proposed rulemaking which merely reflected changing air traffic estimates. Instead, it is the Committee's firm conviction that the crux of the Metropolitan Washington airports issue is how quickly, conveniently, and reliably the traveler can get from downtown, and near-downtown, locations to his destination city, with the least reason-

able intrusion on the nonflying public. What airport the traveler uses is, from his standpoint, inconsequential: his need is rapid, convenient, and reliable access.

The local and State governments in the area, along with the Federal Government, have poured millions of dollars into highway systems and support mechanisms to carry out the plan, including the current 12-gate expansion of BWI's terminal to accommodate Piedmont's hub operation. The BWI rail station has been in operation for 2 years, bringing the airport within 30 minutes of Union Station. The 2-year effective date ties in with the opening of the Dulles access road to Interstate 66 and further improvements in ground transportation. This connector will reduce travel time between Dulles and downtown Washington to 30 minutes, and high-occupancy-vehicle enforcement will not interfere with those driving or busing to and from Dulles.

However, the Committee does believe that further improvements in access to Dulles and BWI need to be made, and notes the following testimony submitted by the FAA:

> The FAA's interest in a heliport at Union Station stems from the growing importance of helicopters and our responsibilities to provide for our Nation's air transportation needs. Scheduled helicopter service from a downtown location to Dulles International and Baltimore Washington International Airports, as well as other outlying communities, would greatly enhance the area's air transportation system. Such service could improve the use of Dulles International Airport by attracting more air carriers, relieve congestion at Washington National, and, as surface congestion grows, provide quick and efficient connecting air service for the public. Proponents of a heliport at Union Station foresee that it would have positive economic benefits. Revenues would be generated through a system of landing and parking fees. Studies of a downtown heliport location have shown Union Station to be a prime site, offering connections to other forms of transportation; minimum environmental impact with departures and arrivals over the rail yard to the north; and close proximity to key Government officials, business and community travelers, and congressional personnel. A formal study conducted by the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board evaluated potential downtown heliport sites and concluded that the Union Station location offered minimal noise impact and effect on airspace restrictions.
>
> The FAA is ready to assist other elements of the Department of Transportation, the District of Columbia, and the Congress in establishing a viable D.C. downtown heliport.

The Committee believes that a downtown heliport is worthy of serious consideration, and directs the Secretary to submit her findings and recommendations on this to Congress no later than February 1, 1984. The Secretary shall consult with city officials, regional planning agencies, Members of Congress, air carriers, and other knowledgeable and interested parties in making her study. Contractual funds shall be made available to obtain outside expertise if necessary. The study shall include, but not be limited to, the feasibility of various sites for a heliport; the costs, safety, and security considerations involved therein; the estimated usage by the public of such a facility; the impact of such service on operations at Dulles and BWI; noise considerations; and the impact of such service on passenger traffic at National, Dulles, and BWI.

f. Landing fees and mobile lounge fees at Dulles for calendar years 1981 and 1982 were waived, and most carriers agreed to deposit 77 cents per passenger into a trust fund set up with the First and Merchants Bank of Virginia. The money from the trust fund would then purchase approximately 14 buses to enhance surface transportation to and from Dulles and the Washington metropolitan area. Several weeks ago the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia ruled that these funds deposited by the carriers are Federal funds and directed that they be turned over to the FAA for deposit into the general fund of the U.S. Treasury. The air carriers are, therefore, not able to spend the funds to purchase the buses for the airport as initially intended. Consequently, the Committee has restored the $3,500,000 cut by the House from the budget request for "Construction, Metropolitan Washington Airports." Language is included in the bill to allow the purchase of buses to further improve access to Dulles Airport.

g. In consideration of its findings and conclusions above, the Committee has stricken from the bill the House general provision which would have prevented the Department of Transportation from resolving, through its rulemaking process and the steps outlined above, the best means of achieving an equitable national airports policy for the Washington, D.C., metropolitan region.

Construction, Metropolitan Washington Airports

Appropriations, 1983	$11,080,000
Budget estimate, 1984	15,250,000
House allowance	11,750,000
Committee recommendation	15,250,000

This appropriation finances construction of major improvements and expansion of facilities at Washington National and Dulles International Airports. Projects are undertaken, whenever necessary, to insure the capacity of these airports to adequately, safely, and efficiently meet air travel needs of the public and to promote development of aviation activities in general.

The bill includes $15,250,000 to finance major improvements and expansions of facilities at the metropolitan Washington airports. This is the same amount as the budget request and $3,500,000 more than the House allowance.

Landing fees and mobile lounge fees at Dulles for calendar years 1981 and 1982 were waived, and most carriers agreed to deposit 77 cents per passenger into a trust fund set up with the First and Merchants Bank of Virginia. The money from the trust fund would then purchase approximately 14 buses to enhance surface transportation to and from Dulles and the Washington metropolitan area. Several weeks ago the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia ruled that these funds deposited by the carriers are Federal funds and directed that they be turned over to the FAA for deposit into the general fund of the U.S. Treasury. The air carriers are, therefore, not able to spend the funds to purchase the buses for the airport as initially intended. The Committee believes this plan to be vital to the continued

development of, and access to, Dulles International Airport. Accordingly, the Committee is including funds and bill language for the procurement of 14 buses which, the Committee understands, would be operated and maintained by a private contractor.

Aircraft Purchase Loan Guarantee Program

(Limitation on New Loan Guarantees)

The aircraft purchase loan guarantee program was established pursuant to Public Law 85-304, as amended, which gave the Secretary of Transportation the authority to provide Government guarantee of private loans to certain air carriers for the purchase of modern aircraft and equipment when financing was not otherwise available on reasonable terms. This authority is to expire on October 23, 1983, and no activity is assumed for those 3 weeks of the new fiscal year.

The Congress is now considering fiscal year 1983 legislation which would permit the Secretary of Transportation to issue notes to the Secretary of the Treasury to cover any necessary expenses relating to loan guarantee defaults occurring in fiscal year 1983 up to a maximum of $150,000,000.

For fiscal year 1984, the Committee agrees with the House in approving language prohibiting further aircraft purchase loan guarantee commitments. This is consistent with the phaseout of this program. The House also deleted language which would permit FAA to make payments for defaulted loans from the agency's operations appropriation and it indicated that it would consider supplemental requests if any loan defaults occur during fiscal year 1984.

The DOT has indicated that it agrees with the House action in that the operations appropriation funds should not be diverted to finance default loan payments, and it has recommended that the proposed supplemental plan—that is, issuance of notes or other obligations to finance default aircraft purchase guarantees—be continued throughout fiscal year 1984 (not to exceed $250,000,000 when aggregated with fiscal year 1983 obligations).

While the House Committee has indicated its willingness to consider supplemental requests for necessary funds, it appears unlikely that the process of submission, review, and approval could be accomplished on anything less than a total emergency basis if required settlement dates with lender(s) are to be met. For example, the total elapsed time from the date of the demand for payment upon the Government (the point in which the contingent liability becomes an actual liability) to the settlement date with the lender(s) ranges from 60 to 90 days. Thus, if the supplemental budget request was not approved prior to settlement date, the full faith and credit obligation of the U.S. Government could not be fulfilled. Further, in all likelihood, separate supplemental budget requests would be necessary for each aircraft loan guarantee default which occurred, since time would not permit the flexibility to consolidate requests.

Accordingly, the Committee believes it advisable to permit the Secretary of Transportation to issue notes or other obligations to finance defaults and it is including general provision language authorizing this function in fiscal year 1984.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

Summary of Fiscal Year 1984 Program

The principal missions of the Federal Highway Administration are: administration, in cooperation with the States, of the Federal-aid highway construction program, including the interstate, primary, bridge, secondary, and urban programs; regulation and enforcement of Federal requirements relating to the safety of operation and equipment of commercial motor carriers engaged in interstate or foreign commerce; governing the safety in movement over the Nation's highways of dangerous cargoes such as explosives, flammables, and other hazardous materials; and provision of assistance under the Appalachian Region Development Act of 1965, as amended, for construction of a development highway system serving the Appalachian region.

Under the Committee recommendation a total program level of $12,651,590,000 would be provided for the activities of the Federal Highway Administration for fiscal year 1984. This is $9,970,000 more than the budget estimate, $23,630,000 less than the House allowance, and $322,087,000 less than the amounts provided for similar activities for fiscal year 1983.

The following table summarizes the fiscal year 1983 program levels, the fiscal year 1984 budget estimates and the Committee's recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1983 program level	Fiscal year 1984 budget estimate	Recommended in the House bill	Committee recommendations
Limitation on general operating expenses	(188,500)	(202,687)	(198,600)	(202,687)
Motor carrier safety	[1] 12,600	13,020	13,020	13,020
Motor carrier safety grants	.....	10,000	8,000	10,000
Highway safety research and development	[2] 8,000	8,600	8,500	8,500
Highway-related safety grants	[3] 377	[4] 10,000	[4] 10,000	[4] 10,000
Railroad/highway crossings demonstration projects	.....	.....	35,700	.....
Federal-aid highways	[4] 12,375,000	[4] 12,600,000	[4] 12,600,000	[4] 12,600,000

See footnotes at end of table.

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1983 program level	Fiscal year 1984 budget estimate	Recommended in the House bill	Committee recommendations
Interstate transfer grants—Highways	518,000	([5])	([5])	([5])
Other highway programs	59,700	.....	.....	10,070
Total	12,973,677	12,641,620	12,675,220	12,651,590

[1] Includes $1,000,000 derived by transfer.
[2] Includes $300,000 derived by transfer.
[3] Contract authority obligation ceiling less rescission.
[4] Contract authority obligation ceiling.
[5] Contract authority of $700,000,000 provided in Public Law 97–424 within Federal-aid highways.

Limitation on General Operating Expenses

Limitation, 1983	($188,500,000)
Budget estimate, 1984	(202,687,000)
House allowance	(198,600,000)
Committee recommendation	(202,687,000)

The limitation on general operating expenses provides for virtually all the salaries, expenses, and research and development programs of the Federal Highway Administration.

The Committee recommends that a limitation of $202,687,000 be provided for salaries and expenses of the Federal Highway Administration. This amount is the same as that requested in the budget, $4,087,000 more than that recommended by the House, and $14,187,000 more than the level provided for fiscal year 1983.

The bill includes a provision that would approve the request of the State of Minnesota for the waiver of repayment of Federal funds for withdrawn I–335 right-of-way.

RURAL TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The Committee directs FHWA to continue the rural transportation assistance program at a $5,000,000 level. In last year's Senate report, FHWA was directed to set forth an implementation schedule outlining specific efforts to serve rural transportation needs. That report of March 21 stated:

> Nationwide, the nonurbanized population is increasing, and the migration from rural to urban areas has been reversed. * * * The entire rural economy is very dependent on an adequate transportation infrastructure and services as well as energy supply. * * * Most local governments have a very limited resource base. However, rural governments have the major responsibility for over 60 percent of the roads and bridges in this country. * * * Rural areas (communities, shippers, and carriers) are faced with many transportation changes as a result of deregulation (air, rail, motor carrier), proposed block grants, and decreases in Federal assistance. Most rural communities, shippers, or carriers are faced with one or more of the fol-

lowing complex transportation problems: inadequate roads or bridges; rail abandonment; withdrawal of scheduled air service; implementation/continuation of public transportation service. Most rural areas do not have the organization, financial resources, or expertise to analyze or solve the problems locally. They seek funding and technical assistance elsewhere. The State and Federal governments respond with programs and technical assistance which are categorical and usually inadequate.

The Committee feels these conclusions by FHWA justify the continuation of the program. Currently, the rural transportation assistance program is comprised of 21 ongoing projects. Last year, more than 60 projects were reviewed for possible funding. FHWA is commended for selecting meritorious and regionally-balanced projects this fiscal year.

The Department shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations a summary by project of how fiscal year 1982–84 rural transportation program funds have been allocated, expected project completion dates, and results of projects finalized during fiscal years 1982 and 1983. This report is due January 15, 1984.

Motor Carrier Safety

Appropriations, 1983	$11,600,000
(By transfer)	(1,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1984	13,020,000
House allowance	13,020,000
Committee recommendation	13,020,000

The motor carrier safety mission is to protect the public from risks inherent in commercial truck and bus transportation by highway. The program involves Federal safety inspection and law enforcement over the highway operations of commercial interstate carriers.

The bill includes a total of $13,020,000 for motor carrier safety. This is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The Committee shares the concern of the House regarding duplicative and overlapping "surface-mode" safety activities. Testimony was heard from various departmental witnesses to the effect that this issue has been reviewed internally. Before any consolidations are finalized, however, the Department should consult with the House and Senate Committees to insure that program delivery is not compromised or diminished by such a reorganization.

Motor Carrier Safety Grants

Appropriations, 1983	.....
Budget estimate, 1984	$10,000,000
House allowance	8,000,000
Committee recommendation	10,000,000

This program was first authorized by the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982. It would provide grants to States for improved enforcement of Federal and State motor carrier safety rules. It has been shown that added enforcement of truck safety rules reduces truck-related accidents and fatalities.

The Committee recommends a $10,000,000 level which is $2,000,000 more than the House allowance and the same as the budget request. The reduction by the House reflects anticipated slow startup of this new program. However, the Committee feels that by providing the full amount, the States will not perceive any diminution of Federal support for this safety activity.

FHWA is instructed to report to the Committee by December 15, 1983, on its framework for implementation of this program. The report should address efforts undertaken to integrate this grant-in-aid program with the ongoing State hazardous materials enforcement development program of RSPA. A State-by-State breakdown of funds should also be included.

Highway Safety Research and Development

Appropriations, 1983	$7,700,000
(By transfer)	(300,000)
Budget estimate, 1984	8,600,000
House allowance	8,500,000
Committee recommendation	8,500,000

This activity seeks to identify, correct, and evaluate those critical elements that contribute to loss of life, disabling injuries, and property damage on American highways. The emphasis of research is to provide workable and timely solutions to a set of critical safety problems. Major projects involve improved traffic barriers, construction zone safety, traffic and pedestrian safety, and rural highway safety improvements.

The Committee recommends $8,500,000 for highway safety research and development. This is $100,000 less than the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

Access Control Demonstration Project

The House bill includes a provision which extends the availability of funds authorized by section 150 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1978. Information provided by the Department of Transportation is that these projects can be obligated by the expiration date of September 30, 1983. Since this extension may constitute an unnecessary reappropriation, the Senate bill deletes the provision.

Highway-Related Safety Grants (Trust Fund—Appropriation to Liquidate Contract Authorization)

Appropriations, 1983	($22,998,000)
Rescission of contract authority	−9,623,000
Budget estimate, 1984	(9,738,000)
House allowance	(9,738,000)
Committee recommendation	(9,738,000)

Section 402 of title 23, United States Code, authorizes funds to assist States and localities in implementing highway safety programs in accordance with uniform standards established by the Secretary. Most of the activities carried out under the FHWA standards involve development and implementation of systems, procedures, manuals, et cetera, to assist highway agencies in the orderly planning and implementation of safety improvements on highway facilities.

The Committee recommends $9,738,000 for liquidation of contract authority for highway-related safety grants. This is the same amount as the budget request and the House allowance. The bill also retains the House language continuing the limitation on obligations for this program at $10,000,000.

Railroad-Highway Crossings Demonstration Projects

Appropriations, 1983	
Budget estimate, 1984	
House allowance	$35,700,000
Committee recommendation	

The railroad highway crossings demonstration projects are authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973, as amended, and title III of the National Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1974.

Projects are funded under this account when a rail-highway crossing creates a safety hazard, or impedes pedestrian or highway flow.

The Committee recommends no new funding for this program. The House allowance includes $35,700,000. There is no budget request for this program.

The Committee believes that this program is meritorious and of critical importance to the affected cities. However, budget constraints preclude the Committee from providing a new appropriation at this time.

Federal-Aid Highways (Trust Fund—Appropriation to Liquidate Contract Authorization)

Appropriations, 1983	($8,200,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1984	(11,600,000,000)
House allowance	(11,600,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(11,600,000,000)

This activity comprises the majority of all federally-aided programs through which the States are financially and technically aided to continue a national highway system that meets the transportation needs of the Nation in terms of capacity and safety.

All programs included within the Federal-aid account are financed from the highway trust fund. Authorizations in the form of contract authority are enacted in substantive legislation. These authorizations are apportioned and/or allocated to the States and generally remain available for obligation over a 4-year period. Liquidating cash appropriations are subsequently requested to fund outlays resulting from obligations incurred under contract authority.

The Committee recommends a liquidating cash appropriation of $11,600,000,000 for the Federal-aid highway program, which is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

OBLIGATION CEILING

The bill also includes language limiting obligations to $12,600,000,000. This is the same as the budget request and the House allowance. This level represents a $225,000,000 increase over the level set for

fiscal year 1983 in the jobs bill, Public Law 98–8. Obligations for emergency relief, certain bridge and demonstration projects, the Union Station redevelopment project, and minimum allocations are exempted from the limitation.

The Secretary of Transportation is directed to take note of the language in section 104(d)(2) of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 which requires that priority be given to those States having large unobligated balances of funds upon redistribution of obligation authority on August 1, 1984. It is the Committee's understanding that this language refers to States, such as Pennsylvania, which previously lacked sufficient funds to meet Federal matching requirements, or for environmental considerations, slowed the rate of obligation on high cost projects. In cases where these problems have been resolved, an effort should be made to permit States to draw down Federal apportionments that remain available to them.

GENERAL PROVISION

The Committee has deleted House section 316 prohibiting the use of funds to implement or enforce regulations designating noninterstate Connecticut highways for larger truck access. The Committee recognizes that this issue is being addressed by the courts and the Department is working with States for the final designation of truck routes by October 1, 1983.

The Department should continue to work closely and cooperatively with concerned States for a system plan that assures safety and maximum uniformity for the movement of interstate commerce.

MIANUS BRIDGE

The collapse of the Mianus Bridge on I–95 in the State of Connecticut represents a serious impediment to the flow of interstate traffic and the congestion which has resulted from 90,000 cars and trucks being diverted onto alternate highways and local roads further threatens the safety of motorists.

Although this bridge was State-built and financed and is part of a toll road, the current and future disruption of traffic along the I–95 corridor into New England has national consequences. Therefore, the Committee believes that it is entirely appropriate to make funds available to the State of Connecticut, over and above the insurance policy on the bridge, so that the bridge can be repaired in a manner that provides maximum protection for the future safety of all motorists who must drive on it. These funds shall be made available from the emergency relief program under the Highway Trust Fund (section 125, Title 23, U.S.C.), which has been authorized at $100,000,000 per year through 1986.

Additionally, due to the collapse of the Mianus Bridge, the towns of Greenwich, Conn., and Port Chester, N.Y., have had to incur additional costs for road repair, additional police to direct traffic, and other ancillary costs. To help defray these expenses, the Committee believes that it is appropriate to make additional emergency relief money not to exceed $1,000,000 available, to be equally divided between these towns.

INTERSTATE TRANSFER GRANTS—HIGHWAYS

Appropriations, 1983	$518,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984	.....
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

This activity provides funding of highways substituted for Interstate System segments withdrawn from the system under 23 U.S.C. 103(e)(4). After the joint request by a State Governor and the local governments concerned, the Secretary may withdraw (from the Interstate System) interstate highway segments which pass through or connect urbanized areas within the State determined not to be essential to a unified Interstate System. The value of a withdrawn segment, adjusted for inflation, establishes an authorization against which Congress may provide funds.

The Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 provides contract authority for this program for 1983 through 1986. The contract authority is part of the Federal-aid highways program. Consequently, the Committee recommends no further appropriations for the program under this heading.

The Committee recognizes that the Department is in the process of preparing a report to Congress on the interstate transfer grant cost estimate in order to derive allocations for fiscal year 1984. The Committee is aware that 75 percent of the $700,000,000 contract authority will be allocated by formula. This formula approach will result in some areas receiving allocations that partially fund operable segments or fall short of completing a State's participation in the program. With this in mind the Committee urges the Secretary, in utilizing her discretion over the remaining 25 percent, to achieve a total program level in fiscal year 1984 as follows: $33,000,000—Portland, Oreg.; $5,000,000—San Francisco, Calif.; and $21,000,000—Tucson, Ariz.

The Committee notes that the Denver C–470 project must receive a consistent level of funding in order to keep this vital project on schedule. The Committee also recognizes that safety and highway reconstruction activities of the District of Columbia necessitate a $27,000,000 fiscal year 1984 program requirement.

RIGHT-OF-WAY REVOLVING FUND

(LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS—TRUST FUND)

Limitation, 1983	.....
Budget estimate, 1984	($30,000,000)
House allowance	(30,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(30,000,000)

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 authorized $300,000,000 for the establishment of the right-of-way revolving fund. This fund is utilized to make cash advances to the States for the purpose of purchasing right-of-way parcels in advance of highway construction and thereby preventing the inflation of land prices from causing a significant increase in construction costs. When right-of-way aquisition has been made and highway construction is initiated, the State becomes eligible

for Federal grants under the various Federal-aid highway authorizations. At the point when progress payments are made to the State for construction, the State in turn reimburses the revolving fund for advances made to that State for right-of-way acquisition. Utilizing this method of funding, all reimbursements made to the revolving fund may be reallocated to other States requiring advances. In order to assure prudent management of Federal credit programs, a fiscal year 1984 $30,000,000 limitation on gross obligations is provided.

Access Highways to Public Recreation Areas on Certain Lakes

The bill includes funding to complete ongoing access highway projects. Recent confusion over the Federal match for this program in the wake of enactment of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act has necessitated this additional appropriation of $4,270,000. The bill contains a general provision which clarifies that ongoing access highway projects will be funded at a 95-percent Federal share.

Waste Isolation Pilot Project Roads

The bill contains a general fund appropriation in the amount of $5,800,000 for planning and design activities for roads connected with the proposed waste isolation pilot project (WIPP) in New Mexico. This project, a $2,100,000,000 facility for the disposal of transuranic nuclear wastes generated as part of the atomic energy defense activity of the Department of Energy (DOE), was authorized by Congress in 1979 (Public Law 96–164). Subsequent to that authorization, the State of New Mexico and DOE entered into a stipulated agreement resolving off-site concerns, which is being overseen by the U.S. District Court. Part of that agreement addresses the upgrading of existing highways that would become probable transportation routes for waste shipments to the site. Since the terms of the agreement cannot be met through existing DOT programs, this special appropriation is necessary.

The funds provided in the bill are made available only when the Department of Energy commences construction of the WIPP. Improvements are those specified in section 3.E(2)(b) of supplemental stipulated agreement 81–0363 of the U.S. District Court for the District of New Mexico. The Committee directs the Federal Highway Administration to report to the Committee by February 1, 1984, on plans for obligation of the $5,800,000, total mileage and cost for repair and upgrading of roads mentioned in the stipulated agreement, and a yearly funding schedule for such repairs.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

Summary of Fiscal Year 1984 Program

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration was established as a separate organizational entity in the Department of Transportation in March 1970, to reduce the mounting number of deaths, injuries, and economic losses resulting from traffic accidents on the Nation's high-

ways. Later activities were added for improving automotive fuel economy and to institute some consumer programs. The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act provides for the establishment and enforcement of Federal safety standards for motor vehicles and associated equipment and research, including the operation of required testing facilities. The Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act initially provided for the establishment of low-speed collision bumper standards, consumer information activities, diagnostic inspection, and odometer regulations. The law was subsequently amended to incorporate responsibility for the administration of Federal automotive fuel economy standards. Under section 403 of title 23, United States Code, technical assistance is provided to the States in the conduct of their highway safety programs, and demonstration projects are conducted to show the effectiveness of new techniques and countermeasures to address highway safety problems.

The Committee recommends a total program level of $219,950,000 for the activities and programs of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration for fiscal year 1984. This is $23,002,000 more than the budget request, $2,000,000 more than the House allowance, and $34,050,000 more than the amount provided in fiscal year 1983.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1983 program level	Fiscal year 1984 budget estimate	Recommended in the House bill	Committee recommendations
Operations and research	74,000	77,998	78,000	78,000
Highway traffic safety grants	[1]95,000	[1]77,000	[1]100,000	[1]100,000
Highway safety information and education grants	[2]2,000	[2]4,000	[3]2,000	[3]4,000
Alcohol safety incentive grants	[2]14,900	[2]37,950	[1]37,950	[1]37,950
Total	185,900	196,948	217,950	219,950

[1] Contract authority obligation ceiling.
[2] Estimated obligations.
[3] House limit of $4,000,000 on cumulative obligations disapproved by Committee.

Operations and Research

Appropriations, 1983	$74,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984	77,998,000
House allowance	78,000,000
Committee recommendation	78,000,000

The bill includes an appropriation of $78,000,000 for operations and research, which is $2,000 more than the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

The amount appropriated is to be distributed as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1983 program level	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendations
Rulemaking	5,591	6,367	5,900	6,300
Enforcement	9,629	11,583	11,315	10,800
Highway safety	8,828	12,179	11,920	12,200
Research and analysis	34,327	38,220	39,525	39,100
General administration	14,022	7,112	7,000	7,100
Office of the Administrator	1,603	2,537	2,340	2,500
Total	74,000	77,998	78,000	78,000

Rulemaking.—The Committee concurs with the House in instructing NHTSA to improve the new car assessment program and consumer information on bumpers. NHTSA's fiscal year 1984 budget contains bumper-related projects, two of which involve an analysis of model year 1983 bumper insurance claims data, and cost and weight data on model year 1984 bumpers. The Committee directs NHTSA to report by May 1, 1984, on the results of this analysis. The report should include an outline of steps the agency will take to increase the bumper standard, or a detailed explanation of how the existing 2.5-mile standard is beneficial to the American consumer.

An increase of $400,000 over the House level is provided for these projects.

The Committee notes that the Supreme Court recently issued an opinion in *Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association of the United States, et al* v. *State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., et al*, a suit brought by the insurance industry in response to NHTSA's rescission of the passive restraint standard. The court determined NHTSA's action to be "arbitrary and capricious" and remanded this case to the court of appeals for the D.C. circuit "with directions to remand the matter to the NHTSA for further consideration consistent with this opinion." In view of the Supreme Court opinion, the Committee urges the Department to resolve this matter so that passive restraints can be made available to the American public at the earliest practicable date.

Enforcement.—The Committee reduction from both the budget request and House allowance reflects a moderated increase over previous years' levels.

Highway safety.—The increase of $280,000 over the House allowance is provided in recognition of the higher obligation limit for the section 402 program included in both the House and Senate bills. Both House and Senate Committees intend to monitor the safety belt program accomplishments, especially with regard to use of child safety seats. NHTSA's efforts in this area should strive for flexibility to accommodate existing State and local concerns and programs. The greatest hope for increased national seat belt use may lie in evolutionary acceptance by citizens of restraints, from child seats to adult seat belt protection.

Research and analysis.—Additional sums over the request are provided in order to advance emergency medical services research. According to a 1982 survey of State EMS directors, a total of 12 States have in place basic and advanced life support EMS in accordance with NHTSA guidelines (vehicle specifications, communications guidelines, training guidelines, and administrative procedures). These same minimum guidelines have been adopted to some extent, mostly in urban areas, in several other States. The Committee encourages NHTSA to continue to upgrade these guidelines for both basic and advanced life support EMS and to pursue the utilization of these guidelines in all 50 States. The Committee also urges NHTSA to expand the application of the EMS systems model, which is presently being tested in four States, to assist additional States in evaluating and developing EMS systems, with special emphasis on the communication network between vehicles and hospitals so that they can be more responsive to public service emergencies.

The Committee does not concur with the House report requirement that $500,000 be spent at the Transportation Systems Center to assess the economic and technical issues related to fuel economy standards.

General administration and Office of the Administration.—The Committee concurs with House directive requiring an authorized staffing level of 640 positions.

In all these areas, any programmatic adjustments deemed necessary by NHTSA should be requested through the normal reprograming process.

The Committee bill deletes the House provision requiring that $2,000,000 of the operations and research account be available only for activities at the Transportation Systems Center.

Highway Traffic Safety Grants

(Liquidation of Contract Authorization)

Appropriations, 1983	($103,552,000)
Budget estimate, 1984	(118,000,000)
House allowance	(118,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(118,000,000)

Under the highway traffic safety grants program, Federal grants are provided to the States to assist in the establishment and improvement of highway safety programs designed to reduce traffic deaths and injuries. Safety formula grants are apportioned to the States on the basis of population (75 percent), and public road mileage (25 percent). The program requires that the States match 25 percent of the Federal contribution with their own funds. Activities are centered predominantly on efforts that will control the drinking driver; increase the intensity of traffic law enforcement; improve the quality of emergency medical services; implement programs to increase seat belt usage; and improve the collection and analysis of traffic accident data. Incentive grants are also allocated to the States for alcohol safety programs and school bus driver training.

The Committee recommends an appropriation for liquidation of contract authorization of $118,000,000 for highway traffic safety grants programs, which is the same amount as the budget request and the House allowance.

LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS

The Committee has proposed a total limitation of $100,000,000 for obligations to be incurred under the State and community highway safety grant program. This is $23,000,000 over the request and the same as the House allowance. The bill also includes a limitation on obligations for the alcohol safety incentive grant program in the amount of $37,950,000, as estimated in the budget. The Committee concurs with the limitation in the House bill on administrative costs of $4,990,000, and prohibitions on the use of section 402 funds for building enhancements.

SAFETY EDUCATION AND INFORMATION GRANTS

The Committee has stricken the House bill provision limiting to $4,000,000 the cumulative obligations for the highway safety information and education grants. The effort to make the public more aware of the risk of automobile accidents can aid in changing driving habits and can augment growing public awareness about the need for enhanced highway safety. If the section 209 pilot projects are continued, the Committee will be in a better position to assess the effect on the public of mass media.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

Summary of Fiscal Year 1984 Program

The Federal Railroad Administration became an operating administration within the Department of Transportation on April 1, 1967. It incorporated the Bureau of Railroad Safety from the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation from the Department of Commerce, and the Alaska Railroad from the Department of the Interior. The Federal Railroad Administration is responsible for planning, developing, and administering programs to achieve safe operating and mechanical practices in the railroad industry. Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) and other financial assistance programs to rehabilitate and improve the railroad industry's physical plant are also administered by the Federal Railroad Administration.

The Committee recommends a total program level of $974,899,000 for the activities of the Federal Railroad Administration for fiscal year 1984. This is $125,649,000 more than the budget request, $232,376,000 less than the amount provided for fiscal year 1983, and $2,600,000 less than the House allowance.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1983 program level	Fiscal year 1984 budget estimate	Recommended in the House bill	Committee recommendations
Office of the Administrator	13,000	13,867	11,680	11,680
Railroad safety	28,000	26,514	26,500	28,900
Railroad research and development	17,000	16,675	16,225	16,225
Rail service assistance	31,675	[1] 10,194	[2] 25,094	25,094
Conrail labor assistance	[2] 20,000	20,000	[3] 20,000	[3] 20,000
Rock Island labor protection			35,000	35,000
Northeast corridor improvement program	115,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Grants to Amtrak	780,000	662,000	720,000	718,000
Railroad rehabilitation and improvement financing funds	[4] 100,000		[4] 20,000	[4] 20,000
Illinois feeder line assistance			3,000	
Other rail programs	102,600			
Total	1,207,275	849,250	977,499	974,899

[1] Including $854,000 borrowing authority.
[2] Including $10,000,000 derived by transfer.
[3] Including $4,000,000 derived by transfer.
[4] Limit on new loan guarantees.

Office of the Administrator

Appropriations, 1983	$13,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984	13,867,000
House allowance	11,680,000
Committee recommendation	11,680,000

The Office of the Administrator provides support and guidance on critical issues concerning the railroad industry and the day-to-day operations of the Federal Railroad Administration. The appropriation includes two budget activities, executive direction and administration and policy support. Policy support is aimed at resolving critical problems in the railroad industry.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $11,680,000 which is the same as the House allowance and $2,187,000 less than the budget request. The Committee has not approved the proposed merger of budget accounts as proposed by the administration.

Railroad Safety

Appropriations, 1983	$28,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984	26,514,000
House allowance	26,500,000
Committee recommendation	28,900,000

The Office of Safety develops, administers, and enforces programs designed to achieve safe operating and mechanical practices in the railroad industry.

The Committee recommends a $28,900,000 program level for the railroad safety program. This is $2,386,000 more than the budget request and $2,400,000 more than that recommended by the House.

These funds are intended to be distributed as follows:

	Fiscal year 1984 budget estimate	Recommended in the House bill	Committee recommendations
Federal enforcement (field inspectors)	$22,161,000	$22,161,000	$22,161,000
Permanent positions	(379)	(379)	(379)
Grants-in-aid for railroad safety			$2,400,000
Automated track inspection			
Regulation and administration	$4,353,000	$4,339,000	$4,339,000
Permanent positions	(66)	(66)	(66)
Total appropriation	$26,514,000	$26,500,000	$28,900,000

FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

The Federal enforcement program provides for the salaries and related expenses for a force of Federal safety inspectors located throughout the United States. These inspectors investigate and inspect rail carriers' property and operating practices to determine compliance with Federal rail safety rules. They also conduct railroad accident investigations. The Committee recommends the budget request of $22,161,000 to support a field staff of 325 professional and 54 clerical support positions.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR RAILROAD SAFETY

The rail safety grants-in-aid were authorized by section 206 of the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970. The act provided for creation of what is essentially a Federal program to improve rail safety. To achieve this goal, the act relies upon a cooperative Federal-State partnership in which willing States implement federally-established rail safety standards.

The 1970 Rail Safety Act provides that in return for conducting comprehensive rail safety programs under the auspices of the Secretary of Transportation, States are to receive Federal funds of up to 50 percent of their programs' cost, subject to the Secretary's approval.

This provision of such financial assistance on a matching basis to State agencies reduces the need for a large Federal field staff and thereby permits Congress to implement its national rail safety program for less than it would otherwise cost the Department of Transportation to assume the entire financial burden.

The Committee recommends that $2,400,000 be appropriated for these grants. This amount is the same as the fiscal year 1983 level. There was no budget request or House allowance.

The Department is instructed to provide to the Committee, by January 1, 1984, a plan for the transfer of this program to the States in such a way as not to jeopardize State safety programs, or require an increase of Federal inspectors.

AUTOMATED TRACK INSPECTION PROGRAM

No new funds are recommended for this activity. The Committee concurs with House instructions regarding FRA access to safety-related data generated by ATIP vehicles, and to the vehicles themselves when necessary. Furthermore, FRA should report to the Committees on its funding and use of the T–10 vehicle as outlined in the House report.

SAFETY REGULATION AND ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM

The Safety regulation and administration account provides for the salaries and related expense of safety headquarters personnel. The Committee recommends $4,339,000 be appropriated for safety regulations and administration responsibilities. This is the same amount as that recommended by the House, and $14,000 less than the budget request.

Railroad Research and Development

Appropriations, 1983	$17,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984	16,675,000
House allowance	16,225,000
Committee recommendation	16,225,000

The Federal Railroad Administration's railroad research and development program plans and conducts research aimed at improving the safety of train operations. Research and development in the Federal Railroad Administration is performed under a single program, railroad technology research. This program will address research in (1) equipment safety, (2) track safety, (3) dynamic analysis, (4) inspection technology, (5) operating practices, and (6) safety testing.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $16,225,000 for railroad research and development. This is $450,000 less the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

The Committee concurs with distribution levels for research areas outlined in the House report. These reflect FRA's priorities as submitted to Congress, with an appropriate emphasis on safety.

Rail Service Assistance

Appropriations, 1983	$31,675,000
Budget estimate, 1984	10,194,000
House allowance	15,094,000
(By transfer)	(10,000,000)
Committee recommendation	25,094,000

The rail service assistance appropriation stimulates and promotes necessary rail services. The major programs in rail service assistance are: (1) local rail service assistance—provides financial assistance to the States for rail planning; (2) administration and special projects—includes the salaries and related expenses for administering FRA's assistance programs; and (3) Washington Union Station—repair and rental or purchase of the historic building.

The bill includes a total of $25,094,000 for rail service assistance, which is $14,900,000 more than the budget request and the same as the House allowance. These funds are intended to be distributed as follows:

	Fiscal year 1984 budget request	Recommended in the House bill	Committee recommendations
Local rail service assistance		[1] $15,000,000	$15,000,000
Washington Union Station	$3,840,000	$3,840,000	$3,840,000
Labor management practices	$1,000,000	$1,000,000	$1,000,000
Assistance monitoring	$500,000	$400,000	$400,000
Loan guarantee defaults	$854,000	$854,000	$854,000
Salaries and expenses	$4,000,000	$4,000,000	$4,000,000
Total funding	$10,194,000	$25,094,000	$25,094,000
Positions	(51)	(51)	(51)

[1] Includes $10,000,000 derived by transfer.

LOCAL RAIL SERVICE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Title IV of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 established the local rail service assistance program to provide States in the Northeast and Midwest with a temporary means to retain rail service over about 7,000 miles of light density rail lines that were abandoned in the process of forming Conrail. Following a series of legislative changes, the program now constitutes a national program concentrating on track rehabilitation projects. The Federal/State matching share is 70/30 percent.

The Committee concurs with the House funding level of $15,000,000 for the program in fiscal year 1984. However, the Committee recommends an appropriation of the full $15,000,000, as opposed to funding by transfer from the Alaska Railroad. This program was proposed for termination by the administration. Continuing rail abandonments and the necessity to insure a Federal resource for State rail programs result in this recommended funding level, which is a reduction of $5,750,000 from fiscal year 1983.

The Committee does not concur with either the language in the House bill providing $5,000,000 for discretionary grants or fiscal year 1984 earmarkings reflected in the House report. It is the feeling of the Committee that this approach distorts the formula allocation in current law. Upon close review, the Committee feels that States are better served through the formula allocation.

The House provisions in the bill are deleted which preclude States' applying for program grants unless pre-1981 yearly apportionments are spent, except where litigation has caused such delay. Although the Committee shares the House concern over States not expending obligated program grants from past years, there is concern that such statutory language may seriously disrupt the program. Such changes can, instead, be considered by the authorizing committees next year.

The Committee instructs the Department to cooperate with South Carolina's Utilities Commission in its application to fund $30,000 of scuba diving and underwater equipment costs necessary to assess the underwater portion of the bridge over the Waccamaw River on the Conway to Myrtle Beach Railroad.

The Committee is aware of the heavy congestion in downtown Orange, Tex., due to the presence of two railroad lines. This serious and potentially hazardous congestion could be reduced if these two lines were reconstructed to a common alinement. The Committee directs that priority consideration be given to funding a project to alleviate this serious congestion problem.

WASHINGTON UNION STATION

The Union Station Redevelopment Act of 1981 authorizes the transfer of Washington Union Station from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Transportation. The $3,840,000 provided in fiscal year 1984 will be used for the rental or purchase and maintenance of that facility.

LABOR/MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

The budget request and House allowance is approved by the Committee for labor/management cooperative projects in the rail industry.

OTHER PROGRAMS

The Committee has also provided $400,000 for assistance monitoring and $854,000 for loan guarantee defaults, as requested in the budget and approved by the House.

The Committee expects the Department to continue to monitor the development in this country of high-speed rail systems and technologies. It is an appropriate Federal role for the FRA to: encourage such systems in the research and development stage, aid in the identification of technologies, and provide assistance for feasibility studies. The Committee intends to explore FRA's efforts in this area as part of the fiscal year 1985 budget process. The Committee intends that the Department collaborate with participants in the Los Angeles-to-Las Vegas high speed rail project on necessary ridership, environmental and engineering studies, using up to $1,250,000 of previously appropriated funds. In executing such study contracts, the Department should establish terms and conditions for the grants including a process of cost sharing by the States and the private sector.

CONRAIL LABOR PROTECTION

Appropriations, 1983	$10,000,000
(By transfer)	(10,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1984	20,000,000
House allowance	16,000,000
(By transfer)	(4,000,000)
Committee recommendation	16,000,000
(By transfer)	(4,000,000)

Conrail labor assistance, as authorized by the Northeast Rail Service Act of 1981, provides protection to employees who are deprived of employment as a result of changes in the freight and passenger systems of Conrail. Employees may elect lump sum payment or daily subsistence allowances. Benefits are also payable for moving expenses and new career training assistance.

The Committee recommends that $16,000,000 in new budget authority be appropriated for the section 701 Conrail labor protection program. The sum of $4,000,000 is transferred from the unobligated balances of "Rail labor assistance", as proposed by the House. The budget request was $20,000,000.

The bill includes a provision making available such sums as may be necessary for administrative expenses of the Railroad Retirement Board from this account.

Rock Island Labor Protection

Appropriations, 1983	.....
Budget estimate, 1984	.....
House allowance	$35,000,000
Committee recommendation	35,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $35,000,000 to provide benefits for former Rock Island Railroad employees, as authorized in the Rail Safety and Service Improvement Act of 1982. No budget request has been received to implement the benefit schedule approved by the Department earlier this year.

The Committee concurs with the House report in limiting administrative costs in order to concentrate benefit payments on former employees most in need.

Northeast Corridor Improvement Program

Appropriations, 1983	$115,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984	100,000,000
House allowance	100,000,000
Committee recommendation	100,000,000

Title VII of the 4R Act of 1976, as amended, provides for the upgrading of the Northeast corridor between Boston, Mass., and Washington, D.C. The law requires upgrading of the corridor to facilitate the provision of safe, dependable, rail passenger service and faster trip times. Pursuant to amendments of the 4R Act in 1980, the major improvement work has been redirected toward the most heavily traveled segments of the corridor and emphasizes safety and reliability.

The Committee recommends that $100,000,000 be appropriated for the Northeast corridor improvement program for fiscal year 1984. This amount is the same as that requested in the budget and that recommended by the House.

The budget proposed language prohibiting the reservation of NECIP funds for the rehabilitation of the Philadelphia-Atlantic City rail line. The language has not been included in the bill, since the issue is addressed in the section regarding Amtrak.

The Committee agrees with House report language regarding FRA's commitment to phase II of the South Station project in Boston.

22-774 O - 83 - 5

GRANTS TO NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK)

Appropriations, 1983	$780,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984	662,000,000
House allowance	720,000,000
Committee recommendation	718,000,000

The National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) has been provided Federal assistance through the Department of Transportation since Amtrak's inception in May 1971, to support a national rail passenger system. This assistance has been in the form of grants for capital improvements, operating subsidies, cost sharing for intra-state rail services, and funds for labor protection costs associated with the discontinuance of rail passenger service.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $718,000,000 for Amtrak. This amount is $56,000,000 more than the budget request and $2,000,000 less than the House allowance.

The Committee assumes that, under existing law, Amtrak's operating requirement is $652,000,000. The Committee's allowance also assumes continuaton of State-assisted service (403(b)), and commuter (403(d)) service as prescribed in current law. The Committee also assumes that remaining capital needs, having been addressed in part through Public Law 98–8, the jobs stimulus bill, can be accommodated within remaining funds. The Committee directs Amtrak to proceed with the West Side Connection project within available funds. The Committee does not agree with House report language regarding the potential for Union Station funds to be diverted for the West Side Connection project.

No funds are set aside within the total Committee allowance specifically for the Atlantic City project. However, bill language included by the House is unchanged by the Committee. Such language requires the certification by the DOT Secretary that 40 percent non-Federal funds will be made available for the cost of rehabilitation and improvement of the line, and that Amtrak's Board of Directors not operate rail passenger service on the route unless 80 percent of first-year short-term avoidable costs are recovered and 100 percent thereafter. In the event the Amtrak Board of Directors seeks to undertake this rail service authorized by the Rail Safety and Service Improvement Act of 1982, the Committee agrees that Federal project costs should be identified within available funds, and the Committee expects that these funds will be used to increase and enhance commuter rail service in New Jersey.

Senior citizen fares for Silver Palm.—The new Florida 403b train service between Tampa and Miami has surpassed ridership projections but still has a significant number of empty seats. For example, in May the train surpassed projected ridership by 19 percent yet almost half of the seats were empty. The State has proposed a two-for-one senior citizen fare and additional advertising and promotional work with American and foreign travel agents. The Committee urges Amtrak to cooperate with the State of Florida to implement senior citizen fares as proposed by the State particularly for off-peak periods and to provide additional advertising to take advantage of the strong market potential.

Mobile-New Orleans Amtrak service.—The Committee is aware that Amtrak has been working with the Louisiana/Mississippi/Alabama Rapid Rail Transit Commission to establish passenger service between Mobile, Ala., and New Orleans, La. The Committee urges Amtrak to approve funding for this project under the appropriate section of law in time to implement the service prior to the 1984 World's Fair in New Orleans. The Committee directs Amtrak to consider without prejudice sections 403(b) and 404(g) during its negotiations with the Tri-State Rapid Rail Transit Commission for Amtrak passenger service between New Orleans and Mobile.

Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund

The Alaska Railroad, extending 470 miles from Anchorage to Fairbanks, is operated by the Federal Government under the act of March 12, 1914. The major activity of the rail line operation program is transportation service; the principal supporting activities are maintenance of way, structures, and maintenance of equipment. To the extent possible, programs are financed by revenues earned from freight and passenger services and other incidental services. Appropriations to the Alaska Railroad are required to sustain the railroad's operating plant and facilities at a minimum level. The railroad is expected to be transferred to the State of Alaska, pursuant to Public Law 97–468; therefore, no new funds are appropriated.

Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing Funds

(LIMITATIONS ON NEW LOAN GUARANTEES)

	New loan guarantees
Limitation, 1983	($100,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1984	.....
House allowance	(20,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(20,000,000)

Section 511 of Public Law 94–210, as amended, authorizes obligation guarantees for meeting the long-term needs of the railroads. Railroads utilize this funding mechanism to finance major new facilities and rehabilitation or consolidation of current facilities. The budget request proposes that no new loan guarantee commitments be made in fiscal year 1984.

The Committee recommends limiting new fiscal year 1984 loan guarantees to $20,000,000. This is the same as the House level. It is the Committee's belief that this limitation is appropriate, as the program may play a role in the aftermath of the sale of Conrail, as well as other rail system realinements.

The bill includes language requested in the budget which would enable the Secretary of Transportation to issue promissory notes to the Secretary of the Treasury on section 511 loan defaults. This language is necessary to allow the Secretary of Transportation to meet her statutory responsibility to pay defaults within 60 days after demand by the holder of the defaulted obligation.

The Committee finds that the east-west mainline between Chicago and Omaha, formerly operated by the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad Company, is a vital national transportation link and its preservation as an integral rail line is in the public interest. It is the intent of the Committee that the Department of Transportation speedily give all due consideration to an application for loan moneys to assist in buying and rehabilitating the east-west mainline.

Redeemable Preference Shares

Appropriations, 1983	$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	

Section 505 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976, as amended, authorizes the Secretary of Treasury to purchase fund anticipation notes from the Secretary of Transportation, which funds will be used to purchase redeemable preference shares from railroads to provide for capital needs to preserve rail freight services.

The Committee recommends no additional funds for the redeemable preference shares program.

The Committee has stricken the House provision in the bill calling for the lapse of preference share funds at the end of fiscal year 1984. The Committee takes this action since sufficient time must be made available for the use of these funds. Information received by the Committee indicates that expiration would have serious consequences to applicants in the Midwest. The Committee directs, further, that any unobligated and unreserved funds remain available, for consideration by the Federal Railroad Administration, for meritorious applications.

Illinois Feeder Line Assistance

The Committee bill strikes the transfer of $3,000,000 from "redeemable preference shares" for a grant to fund the Bloomer Line project. This project was funded in the fiscal year 1983 appropriation.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

Summary of Fiscal Year 1984 Program

The Urban Mass Transportation Administration was established as a component of the Department of Transportation by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, effective July 1, 1968, which transferred most of the functions and programs under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (78 Stat. 302; 49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The missions of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration are: to assist in the development of improved mass transportation facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods; to encourage the planning and establishment of urban mass transportation services needed for econom-

ical and desirable urban development; to provide mobility for transit dependents; to maximize productivity of urban transportation systems; and to provide assistance to State and local governments and their instrumentalities in financing such services and systems.

Under the Committee recommendations, a total program level of $4,173,058,000 would be provided for the activities of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration for fiscal year 1984. This is $407,892,000 more than the budget request and $259,534,000 less than the House allowance.

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1983 program level	Fiscal year 1984 budget estimate	Recommended in the House bill	Committee recommendations
Administration	28,081	29,666	29,200	29,666
Research and development	58,250	52,000	54,800	54,800
Formula grants	[1] 2,047,500	1,973,500	2,488,592	2,388,592
Discretionary grants	1,691,650			
Limitation on obligations		1,100,000	1,250,000	1,200,000
Interstate transfer grants—transit	412,000	380,000	335,000	270,000
Washington Metro	240,000	230,000	275,000	230,000
Total	4,477,481	3,765,166	4,432,592	4,173,058

[1] Includes $779,000,000 contract authority under section 9(a) of Public Law 97–424.

Administrative Expenses

Appropriations, 1983	$28,081,000
Budget estimate, 1984	29,666,000
House allowance	29,200,000
Committee recommendation	29,666,000

The Committee recommends the full budget request of $29,666,000, which is $466,000 over the House. This funding level is necessary to provide for 525 positions and related costs associated with the administration and oversight of an $4,000,000,000 program.

The Committee feels that the House reduction is unwise given UMTA's need to improve systems to provide financial control of information, grants management, and operating data. The Committee directs UMTA to continue its efforts to develop and implement a more substantial and responsive financial/grants management system.

Research, Development, and Demonstrations and University Research and Training

Appropriations, 1983	$58,250,000
Budget estimate, 1984	52,000,000
House allowance	54,800,000
Committee recommendation	54,800,000

The research and training activity, authorized by the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended, provides for grants and con-

tracts for the purpose of developing, testing, and demonstrating new facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods (operations and managerial). Also funded are grants to public bodies to provide for advanced training of personnel in the mass transportation field, grants to public and private, nonprofit institutions to assist in establishing or continuing programs which combine professional training and research in the field of mass transportation, and projects that address human resource needs as they apply to public transportation activities.

The bill includes $54,800,000 for these research and training activities, which is the same as the House amount and $2,800,000 more than the budget request.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations, budget request, House allowance, and last year's level:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1983 appropriation	Fiscal year 1984 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendations
Bus and paratransit	6,400	8,000	6,500	7,000
Rail and construction	6,100	8,250	9,250	8,250
New technology	14,500		9,000	11,000
Service and methods demonstrations	14,500	9,700	7,500	7,500
Planning and support	3,700	5,100	3,700	3,700
Transportation management	2,000	4,400	2,000	2,000
Statistics, information services and NCTRP	3,850	3,500	3,000	3,000
Safety and security	2,800	3,000	2,800	2,800
Policy	1,200	1,550	1,200	1,200
Management training	1,200	1,500	1,350	1,350
University research	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Human resources	([1])	5,000	6,500	5,000
Total	58,250	52,000	54,800	54,800

[1] Included under discretionary grants.

As shown above, $8,250,000 is proposed for the rail and construction research activity. This is the same as the budget request and provides for a $2,150,000 increase over fiscal year 1983. Within the amount provided, work on the AC propulsion should proceed as outlined in the budget submission.

Of the funds recommended for new technology research, the Committee directs that $10,000,000 be obligated for the continued development of the AGRT and magnetic levitation technologies in 1984 with no more than $500,000 thereof to be used for support contractors. The Committee directs that the funds be used to maximum effectiveness in completing the necessary test facilities and in acquiring the critical subsystems and other equipment to obtain initial test results in 1984 so that system performance benefits may be demonstrated to the transit properties. The Committee concurs with the House report language regarding $1,000,000 for component research.

The Committee does not concur with the House report earmarking funds within the service and methods, and safety and security activities for projects in Hillsdale and Pontiac, Mich.

UMTA should submit a report prior to the fiscal year 1985 hearings on its management and distribution of the university research funds. In particular, the Committee would like an update on UMTA's method of distributing one-half of the funds to eight university research centers, since these limited resources should be directed to those centers with capacity to break new ground and meet a wide range of training needs.

Furthermore, the Committee notes that over the past several years the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee has developed an outstanding program of transportation outreach in training and research. The Committee directs that the Urban Mass Transportation Administration consider the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee for agency funded research and discuss with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations the inclusion of the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee as a university center for transit research and management development.

Formula Grants

Appropriations, 1983	$1,268,500,000
Budget estimate, 1984	1,973,500,000
House allowance	2,488,592,200
Committee recommendation	2,388,592,200

The formula grant program is authorized by sections 9 and 18 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982. It provides grants on the basis of a formula to State and local agencies for mass transportation operating and capital expenses.

The Committee recommends $2,388,592,200, which is $415,092,200 over the budget request and $100,000,000 less than the House allowance. The Committee has not included language limiting operating subsidies, as proposed by the administration. This increased funding parallels congressional intent regarding operating subsidies as reflected in the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982. The administration should explore alternative, creative methods for formula grant savings for future years. The Committee remains concerned that the administration's approach places too heavy an emphasis on capital projects, while neglecting operational needs of transit systems.

Within the Committee allowance, $2,112,232,000 will be available to urbanized areas with a population of 200,000 or more; $206,374,400 for areas under 200,000; and $69,989,800 for nonurbanized areas.

RURAL FORMULA PROGRAM

The Committee will continue to monitor the transition of the section 18 program for nonurban areas which has been transferred to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration from the Federal Highway Administration. The Committee realizes that UMTA staff are making arrangements for this transfer of responsibility effective October 1, 1983. But many issues of continuity and administrative direction remain to be resolved before that date. UMTA is encouraged to work with States which have active section 18 programs, and with other concerned organizations to insure program continuity. Where appropriate, FHWA should continue to advise or administer State programs in order to mitigate program disruptions.

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS (LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

Appropriations, 1983	(1)
Budget estimate, 1984	($1,100,000,000)
House allowance	(1,250,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(1,200,000,000)

[1] General fund appropriations of $1,691,650,000 were provided.

Beginning in fiscal year 1984, funds for this program will be derived exclusively from user fee revenue made available to the mass transit account of the highway trust fund established by the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982.

Section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), authorizes Urban Mass Transportation Association to make discretionary grants or loans to States and local public bodies and agencies thereof to be used in financing mass transportation investments. Such investments may include construction of new fixed guideway systems; extensions to existing guideway systems; major bus fleet expansions; capital grants for emergency repairs to transit facilities resulting from natural disasters; deployment of new technology; innovative transit demonstrations projects; and technical planning assistance.

The Committee recommends an obligation limitation of $1,200,000,000. This is $100,000,000 above the budget request and $50,000,000 less than the level recommended by the House.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Recommended in the House bill	Committee recommendations
Bus and bus facilities	220,000	160,000
Existing rail modernization and extensions	545,000	560,000
New systems and new extensions	400,000	395,000
Planning	50,000	50,000
Elderly and handicapped	25,000	25,000
Innovative techniques and technology introduction	10,000	10,000
Total	1,250,000	1,200,000

BUS AND BUS FACILITIES

The bill includes $160,000,000 under this heading for the purchase of buses, bus related equipment and paratransit vehicles and for the construction of bus-related facilities. This amount is $60,000,000 below the House allowance. These funds will assist in the replacement of many over-age buses in cities of all sizes, permit the expansion of bus service to accommodate community transit needs, help finance appropriate bus maintenance facility modernization or construction, assist in bus rehabilitation, and assist in the purchase of support equipment.

The Committee reiterates congressional direction that major rail areas receive equal consideration for bus grants from the trust fund.

The Committee also intends that recipients of nonurban formula funds be considered equally for bus capital grants which cannot be met from formula allocations.

Beginning in fiscal year 1984, funds for discretionary grants will be derived from gas tax revenue made available to the mass transit account of the Highway Trust Fund. This account was established by the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982. While that legislation changed the source of funds for the discretionary grant program, it did not change the projects eligible for funding under the program. However, the new expanded formula grant program is designed to finance most bus system requirements and a portion of the rail modernization needs. The Committee is committed to insuring that adequate funding is provided for UMTA financing of bus systems. The Committee intends that the fiscal year 1984 level for bus funding shall not necessarily serve as a precedent for establishing UMTA's discretionary grants for bus systems in future years.

EXISTING RAIL MODERNIZATION AND EXTENSIONS

The Committee recommends a total of $560,000,000 for the modernization and extension of existing rail transit systems. This amount is $15,000,000 more than that recommended by the House. The Committee does not concur with the House earmarking of funds for projects within this category.

Rail modernization funds are allocated among the eight "old rail" cities (New York, Northern New Jersey, Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Boston, Cleveland, and San Francisco). The Committee expects that fiscal year 1984 portions of existing funding commitments to rail modernization cities will be accommodated within the allowance.

NEW SYSTEMS

The Committee suggests the allocations below, as compared to House earmarks, for preliminary engineering, right-of-way acquisition, new systems construction, and extensions.

[In thousands of dollars]

City and project	House amount	Committee allocation[1]
Portland (light rail)	42,700	45,800
Baltimore (rail construction)	3,500	3,500
Detroit (automated system and light rail)	50,000	30,000
Miami (rail construction and circulator)	35,000	35,000
Santa Clara (light rail)	30,000	30,000
Atlanta (rail construction)	82,500	100,000
Los Angeles (rail construction)	127,500	110,400
Houston (preliminary engineering)	5,500	10,000
Jacksonville (people mover)	13,000	18,000
San Diego (light rail)	8,300	8,300
St. Louis (preliminary engineering)	2,000	2,000
Buffalo (light rail system)		2,000
Total	400,000	395,000

[1] Pending new start policy.

The Committee in concerned that the allocation of contract authority provided by Public Law 97–424 for new transit systems be undertaken as part of a balanced national policy. Such projects, therefore, should be funded within the framework of the following new start policy:

(1) In evaluating potential new start projects, the Department will pay particular attention to the following factors: the results of alternatives analysis; the degree of cost-effectiveness; and the degree of local financial commitment, including evidence of stable and dependable funding sources to maintain and operate the system. Other factors that may be considered include degree of local government support, degree of private sector support, degree of community support, and participation of minority business.

(2) The Department may work toward establishing a funding goal of 50 percent of the total cost of a new start proposal that should be met from funding sources other than section 3. The Committee recognizes that some urbanized areas may need a transitional period to identify additional sources of funds. Consequently, this goal may not be initially met in all instances. The 50-percent goal could be met through the sum of the local match for the Federal project plus those proposal costs that are funded totally from sources other than section 3, such as section 9 and interstate transfer funds which are appropriately used for this purpose.

The above allocations for major new start projects and extensions, therefore, may have to be adjusted in line with this policy. The Committee expects the Department to request any such adjustments through the normal reprograming process.

The Committee has continued to finance the Banfield light rail project in Portland, Oreg., including $10,200,000 in transit transfer and $45,800,000 in section 3 funds for that purpose. The Committee notes with pleasure that this project is substantially on schedule and that contracts let so far are at or below estimates. The Committee congratulates the region and the agencies involved for their fine performance and are satisfied that this year's appropriation will substantially complete the funding for Banfield and that little or no additional appropriation will be expected, which, however, if required, the Committee expects to be provided from section 3 funds.

Houston is included in the above allocation in recognition of that area's transit needs, and the expectation that engineering funds will be necessary to augment planning funds throughout fiscal year 1984. The Committee joins the House in support of future consideration of a revised transportation plan supported by the local community.

The bill includes language proposed by the House requiring the identification of a source of operating support for the Detroit Woodward project before construction funds are made available.

The Committee commends the Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration for their efforts to control costs on the Buffalo Light Rail Rapid Transit project. As a result of there effort, some $11,000,000, or 2.5 percent of the entire project costs, have been saved. The Committee is concerned, however, that startup costs are not included in the existing project budget. It is the Committee's position that the application for funding to cover the startup costs for the Buffalo system should be favorably acted upon by UMTA. The Committee believes that equity should be provided in

terms of project costs financed by UMTA in all new start systems, and that it is in the best interests of the Federal Government to participate in startup costs in order to protect and promote the Federal investment made in such projects. It is the Committee's intent that startup costs be limited to those one-time costs for vital functions (such as personnel, training, parts, supplies, and enegy), that are necessary to assure the safe and reliable intiation of revenue service for a new start project. The $2,000,000 earmarked for new start funding is intended to begin financing the Buffalo startup costs, and should be treated as an integral part of the total first phase of this project.

PLANNING AND TECHNICAL STUDIES

The Committee recommends that $50,000,000 be appropriated for planning and technical studies. This is the same as the budget request and the House allowance. The major activities funded under this heading include short range transportation system management and transportation improvement programs, alternatives analysis studies, and energy conservation and contingency planning. Funds are also available for planning for the elderly and handicapped, data collection, State planning, and special studies.

The Committee supports the Federal commitment to the annual planning and programing of transit funds by metropolitan planning organizations. The new section 9 program requires a more intense effort among local elected officials and transit operators, working with the MPO, to insure that section 9 funds are programed prudently reflecting the region's transit needs and priorities. The Committee is concerned that in fiscal year 1983, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) deviated from its prior practice in allocating section 8 funds, causing a reduction in funding for MPO's. For this reason, the Committee directs UMTA to distribute fiscal year 1984 funds on the same basis as in fiscal year 1982.

The Committee directs that of the amounts made available for planning and technical studies, $2,800,000 shall be available for preliminary planning and development work for the Orlando southwest corridor mass transit project.

The Committee also urges UMTA to consider Denver RTD's request for $500,000 in planning support.

INNOVATIVE TECHNIQUES AND TECHNOLOGY INTRODUCTION

The Committee recommends that $10,000,000 be appropriated for innovative techniques and technology introduction. This is the same amount as that recommended by the House and requested in the budget. The Committee recommends that $5,000,000 be available for each of the two program activities. The Committee concurs with the House report language regarding the cold weather transit technology program.

JOHNSTOWN INCLINED PLANE

Johnstown, Pa., suffers from the highest unemployment rate in the Nation—more than double the national average. The Committee directs that out of section 3, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration devote ongoing attention to the $1,800,000 repair of Johnstown's Inclined Plane, which formerly carried 89,000 passengers annually, but has been closed since last January for safety reasons.

APPROPRIATION TO LIQUIDATE CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION

(TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1983	
Budget estimate, 1984	($242,000,000)
House allowance	(242,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(242,000,000)

The bill includes the full budget request of $242,000,000 to liquidate obligations incurred under contract authority provided in the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 under section 21 (a)(2) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

INTERSTATE TRANSFER GRANTS—TRANSIT

Appropriations, 1983	$412,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984	380,000,000
House allowance	335,000,000
Committee recommendation	270,000,000

Grants under this activity are authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 and amended by subsequent amendments to the Federal-Aid Highway Act and the Surface Transportation Assistance Acts of 1978 and 1982. The fiscal year 1984 budget estimate includes funding for interstate transfer transit projects only; no funds are requested for substitute highway projects.

The bill includes $270,000,000 for transit projects which have been substituted for interstate highway segments. This is $110,000,000 less than the budget request and $65,000,000 less than the House allowance. Under current law, 50 percent of the interstate transfer/transit funds are to be distributed on a formula basis. The Committee directs the following allocations compared to the House:

[In thousands of dollars]

	House	Senate
Oregon	10,000	10,200
San Francisco	5,000	5,000
Northeast Illinois	45,000	20,300
Sacramento	20,000	20,000
Baltimore	40,000	40,000
New Jersey	6,000	6,000
Duluth-Superior	1,500	1,500
Boston	40,000	20,000
New York (New York City)		12,000
Total	167,500	135,000

The Department should submit requests for reprograming authority, if necessary, to adjust the above allocations.

WASHINGTON METRO

Appropriations, 1983	$240,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984	230,000,000
House allowance	275,000,000
Committee recommendation	230,000,000

Public Law 96–184 (Stark-Harris legislation) enacted January 3, 1980, authorizes a total of $1,700,000,000 for construction on the Washington Metrorail System.

The Committee recommends $230,000,000 be appropriated for the Washington, D.C., metrorail system from this account. This amount is the same as the budget request and $45,000,000 less than the House allowance. As noted by the House, the above sums will be joined by section 9 formula funds, as well as interstate transfer allocated by formula. The Committee requests a report from UMTA analyzing the prospects for completion of the final 25 miles of the 101-mile system under criteria outlined under "new starts."

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Limitation on Administrative Expenses

Limitation, 1983	($1,716,000)
Budget estimate, 1984	(1,825,000)
House allowance	(1,800,000)
Committee recommendation	(1,800,000)

The St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is a wholly owned Government corporation established by the act of May 13, 1954, responsible for the development, operation, and maintenance of that part of the seaway between Montreal and Lake Erie, within the territorial limits of the United States. Under the provisions of subtitle II of the Government Corporation Control Act, the Corporation prepares a business-type budget which is submitted for consideration by Congress. Subject to a limitation on administrative expenses, the Congress authorizes the Corporation to make expenditures from available funds and borrowing authority, and to enter into contracts without regard to fiscal year limitations as are necessary to carry out the programs set forth in its budget.

22-774 O - 83 - 6

The Corporation's operations program provides for operation of all facilities, for maintenance—including major items which are deferred to the non-navigation season—and for planning and development activities. Under its replacements and improvements program, the Corporation undertakes various capital improvements to upgrade and modernize its facilities.

The Committee recommends a limitation of $1,800,000 on administrative expenses, which is the same as the House allowance and $25,000 less than the budget request.

REPRESENTATION LIMITATION

The House bill provided $35,000 in representation funds to the Office of the Secretary, which included formerly separate allowance given to MARAD and the Seaway. The House bill also deleted a provision carried in prior appropriation bills providing a limitation on the Seaway's official entertainment expenses.

In 1956, the Comptroller General expressly recognized that the Corporation had the explicit authority under its Enabling Act to expend corporate funds for representation expenses without the insertion of specific authorization language in any appropriation legislation. Subsequent to the Comptroller General's ruling, the Appropriations Committees began placing an annual limit on the extent to which the Corporation could utilize its toll revenues for representation purposes.

The Comptroller General's ruling came about as the result of an inquiry by Carl Hayden, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. The Committee was of the opinion that representation expenses were "* * * appropriate and necessary as a part of the statutory functions of the Seaway Corporation." Senator Hayden went on to note that "* * * the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is entirely self-liquidating and such an expenditure (representation expenses) would be charged to shipping tolls * * * in calculating the rates of shipping tolls * * *", and requested an opinion of the Comptroller General "* * * as to whether these (representation expenses) are proper and whether they may be made without the insertion of specific authorizing language in the appropriation language."

DOT Order 220.1B, official reception and representation expenses, specifically excludes the Corporation from the procedures prescribed in the order because, "the authority of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is included in the appropriation language of the account 'Limitation on administrative expenses'." Although Congress limits the total amount that can be spent for official entertainment expenses, the funds are derived from the Corporation's toll revenues, not from appropriated funds.

Aside from the matter that it could be argued that the Corporation, in the absence of a representation limit, could spend any amount for entertainment expenses, the Committee believes that it is logical and appropriate that the Corporation's revenues be used for necessary business expenses rather than using appropriated funds. Consequently, the Committee has restored the limitation on representation expenses to last year's level of $3,000.

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

Research and Special Programs

Appropriations, 1983	$20,022,000
Budget estimate, 1984	20,287,000
House allowance	20,200,000
Committee recommendation	20,200,000

The Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA) was established by the Secretary of Transportation's organizational changes dated July 20, 1977. It consolidated functions formerly assigned to the Assistant Secretaries for Environment, Safety, and Consumer Affairs, and includes the Transportation Safety Institute (TSI), systems development and technology, and administration. It also drew functions from the General Counsel, the Transportation Systems Center (TSC), and the Materials Transportation Bureau (MTB).

The mission of the Research and Special Programs Administration is to serve as a research, analytical, and technical development arm of the Department for long range and multimodal research and development, as well as to conduct special programs. Particular emphasis is given to pipeline safety, transportation safety and security, facilitation of domestic and international commerce, and intermodal research and development activities including programs within the university community. Responsibilities of the administration are carried out under the following activities:

Operations.—This activity provides for the administration's salaries and expenses as well as for central supervisory and management for overall planning and direction of the administration; management and execution of transportation programs involving passenger and cargo security, facilitation services, national emergency plans/preparedness, management of the Transportation Safety Institute, and for the conduct of hazardous materials and pipeline safety regulatory and enforcement programs.

Research and development.—This activity provides for research and development to complement research programs of the operating administrations, to stimulate industry efforts to advance transportation technology, to encourage university research, and to support hazardous materials and pipeline safety regulatory and enforcement programs.

Grants.—This activity provides for grants-in-aid to State agencies of up to 50 percent of the actual costs for conducting a gas pipeline safety program as authorized by the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968.

The Committee recommends that $20,200,000 be appropriated for research and special programs. This amount is the $87,000 less than the budget request and the same as the House allowance. The Committee does not endorse the programmatic assignment of funds reflected in the House report, and instructs the Department, instead, to allocate resources among programs as indicated in the budget submission to Congress. Such levels are necessary in order to meet hazardous materials and pipeline safety program requirements. The Committee instructs RSPA to continue production and distribution of the emergency response guide, and State enforcement training efforts.

The Committee also opposes the House designation of $750,000 for historically black colleges, but instructs RSPA to continue efforts to foster the participation of historically black colleges in the university research program.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Salaries and Expenses

Appropriations, 1983	$24,946,000
Budget estimate, 1984	25,895,000
House allowance[1]	26,795,000
Committee recommendation	26,795,000

[1] Includes $900,000 provided under a separate account for "Bid rigging investigative support."

The Inspector General Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–452), created an independent and objective organization to conduct and supervise audits and investigations designed to (1) promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, and prevent and detect fraud and abuse in departmental programs and operations; and (2) to provide a means of keeping the Secretary of Transportation and Congress fully and currently informed of problems and deficiencies in the administration of such programs and operations. The Office of Inspector General was implemented by the transfer, on February 25, 1979, of seven separate audit and investigative activities located throughout the 50 States and Puerto Rico.

The headquarters audit operation is composed of program offices which correspond to one or more transportation modes. Each office director is responsible for performing headquarters audits of assigned modal administration. Audit offices are located in 9 of 10 standard Federal regions. There are also five regional investigative offices which are responsible for all investigations within their designated areas. Regional audit offices are primarily responsible for the oversight of non-Federal audit groups and for audit and financial management services to regional administrators. They also perform program and operations audits resulting from known or indicated deficiencies at grantee locations and at departmental entities within the region.

The Committee recommends $26,795,000, which is the same total as the House amount and $900,000 more than the budget request. The increase over the budget is for bid rigging investigative support, and is included in the bill as an earmark rather than a separate appropriation account.

BID RIGGING INVESTIGATIVE SUPPORT

Since 1979 the Office of the Inspector General has worked with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to actively investigate conspiracies to rig bids on public highway and airport construction projects. As of February 24, 1983, this investigation has produced 391 indictments and 326 convictions involving 175 individuals and 151 corporations. This has resulted in $41,600,000 in fines and 41.8 years in prison sentences. More than 90 percent of the completed cases have resulted in convictions, fines, and/or jail sentences. Bid rigging investigations have now spread to 36 States and, according to the General Accounting Office, there is no end in sight.

The Committee shares the House concern about the magnitude of bid rigging problems in the highway construction industry. Although a precise estimate of what highway bid rigging has cost the taxpayer is not available, State and Federal officials generally agree that bid rigging has added about 10 percent to the contract price in those cases where bid rigging has been proven. It is conceivable that bid rigging could be costing the American taxpayer hundreds of millions of dollars. This cannot be allowed to continue.

The Committee expects the Inspector General to continue to make bid rigging investigations its No. 1 priority. The Committee, therefore, endorses the Inspector General's stated objective of doubling the amount of investigative effort devoted to this area. However, in so doing, the Committee is concerned that the full deterrent effect of the Inspector General's office on other programs may suffer as a consequence.

To avoid this situation, the Committee joins the House in recommending an additional $900,000 above the budget request to supplement ongoing bid rigging investigations. These funds are to be used to increase the Inspector General's investigative staff by 20 positions. This sum also includes $200,000 for related travel expenses. The Committee expects these 20 new positions to be filled promptly. The Inspector General is directed to submit a report to the Committee by January 31, 1984, describing the actions taken to fill these positions. In addition, the Inspector General is directed to report immediately to the Committee if any departmental policies, procedures, or management actions (or inactions) are proposed which in any way impede the investigation or implementation of corrective actions related to bid rigging abuses.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

ARCHITECTURAL AND TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS COMPLIANCE BOARD

Salaries and Expenses

Appropriations, 1983	$2,020,000
Budget estimate, 1984	1,700,000
House allowance	1,900,000
Committee recommendation	1,900,000

The Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board was established by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to ensure compliance with the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968. Its primary role is to effectuate a compliance program to ensure accessibility and usability of most Federal and federally-funded buildings by all persons. The Board's functions include: (1) insure that public conveyances, including rolling stock, are readily accessible to, and usable by, physically handicapped persons; (2) investigate and examine alternative approaches to eliminate architectural, transportation, communication, and attitudinal barriers; (3) make recommendations and prepare policy reports to the President and Congress on measures to eliminate such barriers; (4) provide technical assistance to all programs affected by title V of the Rehabilitation Act with respect to overcoming architectural, transportation, and communication barriers; (5) establish minimum guidelines and requirements for the standards issued under the Architectural Barriers Act, as amended. The 22-member Board is composed of 11 public members appointed by the President and 11 Federal agency heads.

The bill includes $1,900,000 for the Board, which is $200,000 more than the budget request and is the same as the House allowance. This amount is necessary to undertake research into reserved sections of the Board's minimum guidelines and requirements. The Board should keep the Committees on Appropriations advised of any efforts it pursues regarding the handling of handicapped passengers on airlines.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Salaries and Expenses

Appropriations, 1983	$19,970,000
Budget estimate, 1984	19,735,000
House allowance	20,615,000
Committee recommendation	21,062,000

The Independent Safety Board Act of 1974 established the National Transportation Safety Board as an independent Federal agency to promote transportation safety by conducting independent accident investigations. In addition the act authorizes the Board to make safety recom-

mendations, conduct safety studies, and oversee safety activities of other Government agencies involved in transportation. The Board has no regulatory authority. The Board's effectiveness depends on its reputation for publishing impartial and accurate accident reports, issuing viable safety recommendations, and on public demand for better transportation safety.

The Committee recommends $21,062,000 for the National Transportation Safety Board, which is $447,000 more than the House allowance and $1,327,000 more than the budget request. The Committee concurs with the House that this additional funding is required to permit the Board to fulfill its statutory responsibilities for accident investigation.

The Committee recommendations include the following increases over the budget request:

Laboratory equipment	$212,700
Additional positions(22)	880,000
Training	30,300
Travel	154,000
Public information	50,000
Total increases	1,327,000

LABORATORY EQUIPMENT

Laboratory equipment is used to retrieve and analyze information from aircraft crash recorders and air traffic control radar data, to analyze aircraft performance data, and to examine metal specimens from transportation accidents in all modes. The equipment contributes directly to tasks necessary to complete Board investigations, and to improve productivity of the Safety Board's staff.

The Board is currently experiencing a large increase in lab computer workload because of its recently-acquired basic graphics capability. An upgraded graphics facility is a crucial element in the Safety Board's increasing efforts to improve productivity, and, indeed, in one of the few ways the Board can continue to improve its already high productivity standards.

The Board urgently needs to install equipment capable of decoding the new model digital crash recorders now installed on aircraft of several airlines. Without new flight data readers and repair of its antique foil-type reader, the country could be faced with the prospect of the NTSB not being capable of investigating the most basic parameters of aircraft accidents.

In addition, testimony reveals that the Board's antiquated computer system and peripherals are out of service at least 25 percent of the time and are facing the additional rigors of workload increases. This is an unacceptable situation given the time-critical nature of the Board's flight data recorder readout requirements.

The Board also needs to update its metallurgical lab X-ray equipment, and cockpit voice recorder audio laboratory equipment and graphic analysis.

It is the conviction of the Committee that Congress can no longer expect the Board to meet its statutory responsibilities without the necessary tools.

ADDITIONAL POSITIONS

The Committee joins the House in providing an increase of 22 positions, to give the Board a funded position level of 347 employees. Although the Committee has not included bill language citing this level as a minimum employment ceiling, it will not hesitate to do so in the future if an adequate employment ceiling is not made available to the Board.

The Committee notes that approximately 12 percent of the Board's staff is currently eligible for retirement and approximately 14 percent will be eligible by the end of the fiscal year. This not only underscores the Board's training needs, but also the obvious need to have new employees to train before retirements occur. The loss of certain individuals in key areas would severely constrict the Board's ability to respond to certain technical aspects of its investigations due to minimal staffing depth in most technical areas.

TRAINING

The Committee commends the Board for its excellent training program, which in fiscal year 1983 included approximately $220,000 to cover the cost of individual development plans for each employee. These plans are developed from the top down with specific emphasis on current and future Board-wide requirements for specific technical skills such as technical training on new generation airplanes (757, 767, DC9–80), engine failure analysis, locomotive systems and performance, traffic accident reconstruction, crash survivability, radar plotting, tankship operation, design, operation and maintenance of gas pipelines, safety evaluation of pipeline systems, highway and aviation crashworthiness advances, aviation psychology, universal and digital flight data recorder familiarization, as well as general administrative and managerial skills. The bill includes an additional $30,300 to better enable the Board to train its employees in rapidly evolving technological disciplines.

TRAVEL FUNDS

The Safety Board's travel plan consists of approximately 78 percent mission travel, 12 percent administrative travel, and the remainder for relocation expenses and training travel. Because the Board's mission is very dependent on travel, budget cuts cannot be absorbed through reductions in mission travel without severely impacting on the effectiveness of its accident investigations and safety recommendations. The reduced level of funding provided in the fiscal year 1984 budget request would require a 3.1-percent decrease in nonadministrative travel and a 57.8-percent decrease in administrative travel. Although the Board has a good record in cost reduction, such a large reduction (19.7 percent) in travel will severely handicap its ability to perform effectively. An additional $154,000 is necessary to restore the travel budget to an acceptable level. Even with this restoration, the Safety Board's fiscal year 1984 travel budget will be 3.2 percent lower than the fiscal year 1983 level.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

The Committee believes that additional funds should be made available for the Board to educate the public to its role in accident investigation and prevention. If an audio-visual presentation were to be assembled, it would serve the dual purpose of introducing the public to the Safety Board and educating special groups to the Board's role and procedures, and how those special groups could be of assistance.

The special groups would include those with whom the Board deals in the course of its work; for example, law enforcement, fire, crash rescue, airport management, and local government personnel. The presentation would address the Safety Board's mandate and operating procedures and advise the special groups of what to expect when the Board becomes involved in an investigtion in which they have played—or will play—a role.

Points such as the critical need to preserve evidence—aimed at the police/rescue personnel—could be used as an introduction to the Board's investigate techniques that would also be of interest to a broader-based audience.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1983	$23,125,000
Budget estimate, 1984	20,890,000
House allowance	18,400,000
(By transfer)	(2,400,000)
Committee recommendation [1]	16,100,000

[1] For the period October 1, 1983 through June 30, 1984.

The Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) is an independent agency with responsibility for the regulation, promotion, development, and maintenance of an efficient and innovative air transportation system, with the variety, quality, and price of service properly adapted to the needs of the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, the Postal Service, and the national defense. The Board carries out these responsibilities through the powers vested in it by the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended by the Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, and the International Air Transportation Competition Act of 1979.

The Airline Deregulation Act fundamentally redefined the relationship between the airline industry and the Board. The act established a policy that minimizes regulatory barriers to entry in most markets and greatly reduces the Board's control over rates. The Board's authority over domestic licensing terminated at the end of calendar year 1981 and its authority over fares and rates terminated on December 31, 1982. Under current law, the Board itself would go out of existence in 1985.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $16,100,000 for the period of October 1, 1983 through June 30, 1984. The House bill provided $18,400,000 for the full year, plus $2,400,000 by transfer from payments to air carriers. The Committee strongly disagrees with the House proposal to take away funds that are estimated to be needed to meet commitments to air carriers in order to pay the salaries and ex-

penses of the Board. In view of the Committee's recommendation for an Airline Deregulation Study Commission, the bill includes CAB funding only through the first three quarters of the fiscal year in order to provide a mechanism by which the Committee may reflect any necessary changes as a result of the study recommendations. In taking this action, the Committee wishes to emphasize that most, and perhaps all, of the Board's functions must continue and will require supplemental funding for salaries and expenses. The Committee's actions should not be interpreted as necessarily accelerating the sunset of the Board.

AIRLINE COMPUTER RESERVATIONS SYSTEMS

The conference report accompanying Public Law 97–369 directed the Civil Aeronautics Board to investigate the effects on competition of computer reservations systems (CRS) used by travel agents. This direction was given subsequent to allegations that carriers were engaging in anticompetitive practices, including computer display bias, bias in fees charged for computer service, data base irregularities, and use of competitive sensitive data. Section 411 of the Federal Aviation Act impowers the Board to "investigate and determine whether any air carrier * * * has been or is engaged in unfair or deceptive practices or unfair methods of competition in air transportation or the sale thereof" and to order carriers to cease and desist from those practices. The Board also has the power and responsibility to promulgate regulations design to protect consumers, safe guard competition, or insure safe and adequate service.

In its report to Congress, the Board states that "there is reason for serious concern over the competitiveness of the CRS industry and its possible impact on air transportation" and "because of the preservation of competitive conditions is so critical of the overall success of airline deregulation, charges about anticompetitive conduct should not be disregarded lightly." Nevertheless, the Board submitted its findings without recommendations or conclusions even though the congressional directive clearly stated that recommendations were to be made and that the Board shall take "the necessary action to remove any biases in the display of schedules and fares, to eliminate any discriminatory costs which could inhibit competition and which discriminate against other airlines and/or travel agents."

The Committee is disappointed that the CAB relinquished its opportunity to apply its institutional expertise to this important public issue. A strong and coherent voice on behalf of the consumer could have been a significant contribution.

Meanwhile, what benefits there are from deregulation may continue to be denied to consumers in a crapshoot free-for-all where the computer ticketing systems designers control the dice and consumers don't know if they are getting the best available fare.

The Committee is hesitant at this juncture, however, to fault the owners of the two major computer ticketing systems for alleged programing and pricing beneficial to themselves, when such self-interest is at the core of deregulation legislation. Whether a true "market" exists,

in the economic sense, or whether such practices are "anticompetitive," in a legal sense, are now under full investigation by the Justice Department's Antitrust Division. Rather than direct the Board to undertake leadership responsibilities in the consumer interest which it is apparently loath to do, the Committee has decided to await the findings of congressional and Justice Department investigations in the hope and expectation that those entities will not shirk their responsibility to the public at large.

Should the Board decide to fulfill its congressional mandate, it should move toward doing so by issuing a notice of proposed rulemaking to develop information and a dialog on the parameters of behavior outside which practices would be found to be anticompetitive, or not in the public interest. This procedure would generate comments from the industry and other interested parties, and would provide a vehicle for input and action by the Board commensurate with procedures used for other consumer protection issues. The rulemaking would also be directed toward avoiding prospective anticompetitive behavior by developing parameters which insure that the public is aware of available price and service options when making travel arrangements; as well as insuring that carriers are not restricted from competing in the marketplace due to abuses of the computer reservations systems.

Airline Deregulation

The recent issue of Consumer Reports offered the following advice to its readers:

> On more than one occasion recently, the air-fare structure has been so chaotic that it was actually cheaper to go to a far destination than an intermediate one. For example, the fare from Los Angeles to New York is sometimes lower than the fare from Los Angeles to Chicago. When that's the case, it makes sense to buy a ticket to New York but to book yourself on a flight that makes a stop in Chicago. Simply get off in Chicago. Caution: make sure your luggage gets off with you. Use carry-on luggage only or persuade the check-in agent to put a Chicago tag on your suitcase.

The independent consumer magazine also had the following to say about "supersaver" fares:

> A supersaver or other discount fare will often require that you be away for a week. If you can't stay away that long, and if the supersaver is less than half the coach fare you'd otherwise have to pay, you should buy two round-trip supersavers rather than a single round-trip coach ticket.
>
> Here's the problem: Suppose that in March you had wanted to go from Boise, Idaho, to Washington, D.C., leaving March 21 and returning March 24. The round-trip coach fare was $618. The round-trip supersaver was only $198. But the supersaver fare required a 7-day stay, and you were making only a 3-day trip.

Strategy: Buy a Boise-Washington round-trip supersaver, leaving March 21 and returning March 28. At the same time, buy a Washington-Boise round-trip supersaver, leaving March 24 and returning March 31. Your total outlay would be $396—That's $222 less than the round-trip coach fare. To go from Boise to Washington, you'd use the first half of the supersaver ticket when you leave Boise on March 21. You may be able to give away the return flight, but if not, simply throwaway the second half. On your return to Boise on March 24, use the first half of the second supersaver ticket. (Note that you must usually buy a supersaver ticket at least 7 days before departure.)

Current fares often bear no relation to distance: It can cost as much to fly 400 miles as 2,400 miles. Residents of many cities, especially smaller points, are paying excessive amounts per mile for airline travel compared to other cities. Because airline seats are a highly perishable product and because there is substantially more airline capacity than traffic, many airlines, especially those with financial troubles, are offering their service at prices far below cost. This has triggered a chain reaction of uneconomic fares which threatens the viability of airlines and could weaken competition in the long run.

The chaos in air fares being endured by consumers and travel agents is clearly reflected in the fact that there are sometimes an astounding 30,000 recorded air fare changes daily in the United States and Canada. Before deregulation, agents could revise their lists of fares once a month without any problems. But with fares changing so rapidly now, it is difficult to keep up to date even with computers, and a 5-minute lag in receiving information can result in a mistake costly to the consumer.

Yet despite all the attention generated by discounts and price wars, airline fares rose 112 percent from October 1978 to March 1983, while the Consumer Price Index rose by 46 percent. But this increase has not been equitably distributed. For example, during the period from 1977 to 1983, coach fares from Chicago to St. Louis rose 81.9 percent in real terms, while coach fares cross country from Los Angeles to Baltimore rose 18.6 percent in real terms. Similarly, non-first-class fares from New York to Los Angeles now cover a spectrum from $199 one-way to $453. Notwithstanding the illegal air traffic control strike and the economy, airline deregulation has resulted in skyrocketing fares and reduced service between most cities, in order to cross-subsidize below-cost fares on cross-country and major-city routes.

The Committee is seriously concerned about the destabilizing effects of deregulation, which has included discriminatory and chaotic fares, employee layoffs and pay and benefit reductions, deteriorating service to small and medium-sized communities, anticompetitive biases, lagging new aircraft orders, bankruptcies, and shaky airline industry financial performance.

The Committee is also concerned that the CAB is not providing Congress with adequate analysis of, and recommended remedies for, the downside results of deregulation.

In order to furnish Congress with objective and timely analysis and recommendations, the Committee has earmarked $500,000 for an Airline Deregulation Study Commission.

Bill language is recommended which provides that such a Commission be appointed within 60 days of enactment to study the questions relating to whether it is necessary to protect the traveling public from the negative effects of deregulation through additional regulation in order to prevent unjust discrimination, predation and other destructive tendencies, and to recommend what action, if any, should be taken by the Congress in connection therewith.

The Commission shall consist of 11 persons of varying backgrounds who are well-informed in matters relating to the economics of airline operations and/or the needs and interests of the traveling public. Four members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and four members by the President of the Senate, after consultation with interested members of their respective Houses, and in addition two members shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Transportation and one member by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Commission shall elect its own Chairman and hire staff, shall receive additional administrative support from the CAB, shall have ready access to all CAB and DOT data and staff, and DOT and CAB shall make office space available for the use of the Commission.

Generally, the Commission shall study the positive and negative effects of deregulation on air transportation as they affect the air traveling public, small and medium-sized communities, stockholders and investors, airline managements, airline employees, travel agents, and U.S. airframe and engine manufacturers, and shall make recommendations on what the Federal Government can to, if anything, to stabilize and counter the negative social and economic aspects that competition and the free market may be unable to address.

Specifically, the Commission shall review those elements of consideration outlined in section 1601(d) of the Airline Deregulation Act, and in addition shall comment with particularity on the CAB's report relative thereto, in compliance with section 1601(c). The Commission will be expected to recommend how the provisions of the Airline Deregulation Act may need to be revised to insure improvement of the Nation's air transportation system and how any residual or reestablished functions of the CAB should be organizationally structured.

The Commission shall report its findings and recommendations to Congress no later than April 15, 1984.

Payments to Air Carriers

Appropriations, 1983	$48,400,000
Budget estimate, 1984	50,800,000
House allowance	50,800,000
Committee recommendation	50,800,000

The Committee recommends $50,800,000 for fiscal year 1984 payments to air carriers, which is the same as the budget request and the House allowance. Also included in technical bill language to provide for the liquidation, if necessary, of fiscal year 1983 obligations under the special subsidy program with fiscal year 1984 appropriations.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1983	$65,600,000
Budget estimate, 1984	58,038,000
House allowance	59,000,000
Committee recommendation	62,000,000

The responsibilities of the Interstate Commerce Commission for regulation of the surface transportation industries are undergoing reexamination and redefinition. In 1980, Congress passed the Motor Carrier Act of 1980. The objectives of the act are to reduce regulatory barriers for those wishing to enter the motor carrier industry, provide greater rate flexibility, ensure protection of shippers' interests, and promote competition within the industry. Congress has also passed reform legislation for the railroad, bus, and household goods industries. Further legislation affecting the Commission's authority is likely.

The bill includes an appropriation of $62,000,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is $3,000,000 more than the House allowance and $3,962,000 more than the budget request.

The following is a summary of the Committee's recommendations:

Program	Fiscal year 1984 budget request	House recommended	Committee recommendations
Policy and analysis	$7,987,000	$7,900,000	$8,000,000
Staff-years	139	139	139
Proceedings	$21,433,000	$21,433,000	$23,000,000
Staff-years	415	415	450
Compliance and consumer assistance	$22,291,000	$22,378,000	$23,600,000
Staff-years	426	426	426
Enforcement	$6,327,000	$7,289,000	$7,400,000
Staff-years	120	145	145

The increase is provided in order to insure that the Commission fully performs its responsibilities under existing law. The Committee does not intend that the Commission be steered toward less oversight by diminution of personnel resources. However, the Committee will monitor closely any further legislative initiatives affecting the Commission's jurisdiction and workload. If during fiscal year 1984 it can be demonstrated that 1,100 staff-years and the budget request level are sufficient, the Committee will propose rescission of excess funds. The Commission is directed to provide a status report by March 30, 1984 to the Committee on the ICC workload under existing law, salary and expense obligations to date, and prospects for reductions in appropriations.

The bill includes a prohibition against the obligation of funds if the Commission has not published an updated user fee schedule by May 1, 1984, unless circumstances beyond the Commission's control preclude meeting the date.

The bill deletes the House provision restricting funds for unreimbursed rental costs of office space, since it is unlikely that such charges will be reimbursed by Federal members of affected organizations.

The Committee notes that, in response to questions posed during the fiscal year 1984 hearings, the Interstate Commerce Commission is conducting a study on rail contract rates. This study will provide the Committee with a comprehensive analysis of railroad contract ratemaking as authorized by the Staggers Act. In particular, the Commission's report should address the impact of contract rates on the grain industry. The Committee expects the Commission's report to be forwarded by the beginning of fiscal year 1984.

Payments for Directed Rail Service

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

Limitations, 1983	($10,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1984	(10,000,000)
House allowance	(5,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(10,000,000)

Under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 11125, when a rail carrier is in such financial trouble that it becomes impossible to continue its operations, the Commission is empowered to direct and pay another carrier to move that carrier's traffic for a period of up to 60 days, which can be extended for an additional 180 days if cause exists. In certain cases, the Commission's use of this authority has not resulted in any cost to the Federal Government. However, there have been several instances where the use of this authority has resulted in a significant liability for payment to an operating carrier by the Federal Government.

The Committee has approved the budget request level of $10,000,000, even though no additional directed rail service is anticipated for 1984. In the event that such authority needs to be exercised by the Commission, proper and timely notification of Congress is required.

PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION

Operating Expenses

Appropriations, 1983	$405,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984	424,362,000
House allowance	418,962,000
Committee recommendation	409,662,000

The Panama Canal Commission is an agency of the executive branch of the U.S. Government, provided for by the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977, and established by the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (93 Stat. 452; 22 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.), enacted September 27, 1979. The authority of the President of the United States with respect to the Commission is exercised through the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army. The Commission is supervised by a nine-member Board; five members are nationals of the United States and four are Panamanians. Board members who are U.S. nationals are appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The Commission was established to carry out the responsibilities of the United States with respect to the Panama Canal under the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977. In fulfilling these obligations, the Commission manages, operates, and maintains the Canal, its complementary works,

installations, and equipment, and provides for the orderly transit of vessels through the Canal. The Commission will perform these functions until the treaty terminates on December 31, 1999, when the Republic of Panama will assume full responsibility for the Canal.

Under the Panama Canal Act of 1979, the Commission is expected to be financially self-sufficient and to make payments to the Republic of Panama as specified in the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977. The amount recommended includes $65,560,000 in annuity payments to Panama pursuant to paragraphs 4(a) and 4(b) of article XIII of the treaty and $10,000,000 for public services to be provided by Panama under paragraph 5 of article III. No funds have been included for payments to Panama under article XIII, paragraph 4(c). These amounts are to be paid out of appropriations only to the extent that Canal operating revenues exceed expenditures of the Commission. Since the Committee does not anticipate that revenues will, in fact, exceed expenditures, no funds are recommended for this purpose.

The bill includes $409,662,000 for the operating expenses of the Panama Canal Commission, which is $14,700,000 less than the budget request and $9,300,000 less than the House allowance.

This reduction is based primarily on the Committee's belief that traffic levels in fiscal year 1984 will be lower than anticipated in the budget request of the Commission. Toll revenues are down sharply, and a recent survey of Canal customers indicates that the situation could deteriorate further. The current traffic patterns and low probability of any significant near-term recovery indicate the need for cost-cutting measures which would reduce the need for appropriations.

The Committee has approved the requested 8,156 positions, which is an increase of 100 positions over the fiscal year 1983 level. Most of this increase is accounted for by the conversion of certain temporary employees to full-time permanent status and by an increase in Canal security personnel.

Capital Outlay

Appropriations, 1983	$29,024,000
Budget estimate, 1984	29,438,000
House allowance	29,438,000
Committee recommendation	29,438,000

The Committee has approved the budget request of $29,438,000 for the capital outlay program of the Commission. This is comprised of $21,749,000 for navigation projects, $2,770,000 for utilities, $1,000,000 for housing and $3,919,000 for general support projects. The major projects approved include $5,400,000 for a replacement tugboat, $2,200,000 to continue the dump scow replacement program, and $1,700,000 to replace a 38-year-old dredge tender.

UNITED STATES RAILWAY ASSOCIATION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1983	$2,950,000
Budget estimate, 1984	.....
House allowance	2,500,000
(By transfer)	(400,000)
Committee recommendation	2,100,000
(By transfer)	(400,000)

The United States Railway Association was established in 1974 to restructure the bankrupt railroads of the Northeast. The Association developed a plan which resulted in the creation of the Consolidated Rail Corporation (Conrail) on April 1, 1976, bringing together the rail properties of the seven bankrupts into a single system. Since that time, USRA has served as Conrail's banker and has monitored the Corporation's progress toward self-sufficiency for the Congress. The Association has also had primary responsibility for defending the Government's interest in the litigation over the value of the rail properties transfered to Conrail from the bankrupt estates.

No budget request was submitted for USRA since its primary functions will have been concluded with the Conrail profitability determinations and the Alaska Railroad valuation. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,100,000 and a transfer of $400,000 from the "Payment for purchase of Conrail securities" account. This funding level is $400,000 less than the House allowance.

These sums are provided in recognition of the need for USRA to continue monitoring Conrail activities in fiscal year 1984, at least through the second profitability test this November. Furthermore, congressional interest in the sale of Conrail may necessitate further analysis by USRA. The Committee intends to review the situation during fiscal year 1984 to ascertain remaining funding needs and missions of the Association.

AIRLINE DEREGULATION STUDY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1983	.....
Budget estimate, 1984	.....
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation (by transfer)	($500,000)

The bill includes $500,000 by transfer from CAB salaries and expenses to initiate an Airline Deregulation Study Commission. This initiative is discussed in detail under the CAB section of this report.

22-774 O - 83 - 7

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

INTEREST PAYMENTS

Appropriations, 1983	$51,663,569
Budget estimate, 1984	51,663,569
House allowance	51,663,569
Committee recommendation	51,663,569

The full budget request of $51,663,569 for the Federal share of the interest payments on the bonded indebtedness of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority is recommended. This is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

The bond repayment agreement between the Department of Transportation and the Authority establishes an overall two-thirds Federal and one-third local cost sharing arrangement. However, for the interest payments due on July 1, 1979 through July 1, 1982 the Federal Government was authorized to fund up to 85 percent of the cost. To the extent the Authority has utilized these additional Federal funds (up to 85 percent), repayment will be required no later than January 1993. Funding for the construction of the rail system is mentioned earlier in this report under the appropriation for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee concurs with the general provisions that apply to the Department and agencies funded through this legislation in fiscal year 1984 as approved by the House with the following deletions:

Section 314. This provision would prevent the use of funds to proceed with proposed rulemaking regarding Washington National Airport.

Section 315. This provision would prevent the use of funds to proceed with proposed rulemaking regarding the repayment of construction differential subsidies.

Section 316. This provision would prevent the use of funds to proceed with proposed rulemaking pursuant to section 411(e) of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 regarding the State of Connecticut.

In addition, the following new provisions were added by the Senate:

Section 315. This section restores language included in last year's act pertaining to travel by the FAA Administrator.

Section 316. This section clarifies the Federal match ratio for certain highway projects over which some confusion has arisen in the wake of enactment of the Surface Transportation Act.

Section 317. This section calls for a comprehensive plan for FAA facilities closures or consolidations and provides for congressional review.

Section 318. This section clarifies congressional intent regarding recent legislation in FAA Academy instructors.

Section 319. This section prohibits the withholding of Westchester County Airport funds as a result of the recently enacted curfew.

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XVI, PARAGRAPH 7

Rule XVI, paragraph 7 states:

"Every report on general appropriation bills filed by the Committee on Appropriations shall identify with particularly each recommended amendment which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

The provisions of the bill recommended by the Committee are included in existing acts or resolutions or are covered under acts or resolutions passed by the Senate during this session, with the exception of a provision relating to an Airline Deregulation Study Commission. Lacking authorizations are two programs of the Coast Guard, one program each of the Federal Railroad Administration and of the Federal Highway Administration, and the Panama Canal Commission.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount in bill	Committee allocation	Amount in bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with the Committee allocation to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1984: Subcommittee on Transportation and Related Agencies	10,900	10,856	25,400	25,426
Projections of outlays associated with budget authority recommended in the bill:				
1984				9,733
1985				8,622
1986				3,418
1987				1,548
1988 and future year				2,506
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1984 in the bill		2,988		1,116

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1983 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1983 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1983 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION							
Office of the Secretary							
Salaries and expenses	40,000,000	42,537,000	41,275,000	41,275,000	+1,275,000	-1,262,000	---
Transportation planning, research, and development	4,900,000	7,256,000	2,500,000	7,256,000	+2,356,000	---	+4,756,000
(Limitation on working capital fund)	(70,909,000)	(68,198,000)	(67,750,000)	(68,198,000)	(-2,711,000)	---	(+448,000)
Total, Office of the Secretary	44,900,000	49,793,000	43,775,000	48,531,000	+3,631,000	-1,262,000	+4,756,000
Coast Guard							
Operating expenses	1,577,403,000	1,687,806,000	1,675,289,000	1,648,256,000	+70,853,000	-39,550,000	-27,033,000
Appropriation for debt reduction	-254,650	-263,544	-263,544	-263,544	-8,894	---	---
(By transfer)	(14,000,000)	---	(12,550,000)	(12,550,000)	(-1,450,000)	(+12,550,000)	---
Total, operating expenses and headquarters administration	1,577,148,350	1,687,542,456	1,675,025,456	1,647,992,456	+70,844,106	-39,550,000	-27,033,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	400,000,000	378,600,000	369,000,000	370,900,000	-29,100,000	-7,700,000	+1,900,000
(By transfer)	(9,000,000)	---	---	---	(-9,000,000)	---	---
Alteration of bridges	12,700,000	13,200,000	7,400,000	12,600,000	-100,000	-600,000	+5,200,000
Retired pay	336,000,000	341,300,000	341,300,000	341,300,000	+5,300,000	---	---
Reserve training	50,000,000	54,805,000	54,805,000	54,805,000	+4,805,000	---	---
(By transfer)	(4,000,000)	---	---	---	(-4,000,000)	---	---

Research, development, test, and evaluation	20,000,000	22,000,000	23,500,000	22,000,000	+2,000,000	---	-1,500,000
Offshore oil pollution compensation fund	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---	---
(Limitation on obligations)	(60,000,000)	(60,000,000)	(60,000,000)	(60,000,000)	---	---	---
Deepwater port liability fund	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---	---
(Limitation on obligations)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	---	---	---
National recreational boating safety and facilities improvement fund	5,000,000	---	---	---	-5,000,000	---	---
(Limitation on obligations)	---	(15,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	---	(-5,000,000)
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	---	(15,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	---	(-5,000,000)
Total, Coast Guard	2,402,848,350	2,499,447,456	2,473,030,456	2,451,597,456	+48,749,106	-47,850,000	-21,433,000
Federal Aviation Administration							
Headquarters administration	54,574,000	62,076,000	56,900,000	56,900,000	+2,326,000	-5,176,000	---
Operations	2,461,783,000	2,639,522,000	2,593,300,000	2,500,000,000	+38,217,000	-139,522,000	-93,300,000
Subtotal, Operations and headquarters administration	2,516,357,000	2,701,598,000	2,650,200,000	2,556,900,000	+40,543,000	-144,698,000	-93,300,000
Facilities, engineering, and development	18,255,000	---	---	---	-18,255,000	---	---
Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	617,550,000	1,000,000,000	985,500,000	750,000,000	+132,450,000	-250,000,000	-235,500,000
(By transfer)	(7,450,000)	---	---	---	(-7,450,000)	---	---
Research, engineering and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	103,000,000	285,984,000	278,000,000	263,452,000	+160,452,000	-22,532,000	-14,548,000
Grants-in-aid for airports:							
Rescission	---	---	-143,500,000	---	---	---	+143,500,000
(Limitation on obligations)	(750,000,000)	(700,000,000)	(900,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(+50,000,000)	(+100,000,000)	(-100,000,000)
(Liquidation of contract authorization) (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	(234,000,000)	(745,000,000)	(745,000,000)	(745,000,000)	(+511,000,000)	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Metropolitan Washington Airports	31,955,000	34,557,000	34,557,000	34,557,000	+2,602,000	---	---
Construction, Metropolitan Washington Airports	11,080,000	15,250,000	11,750,000	15,250,000	+4,170,000	---	+3,500,000
Total, Federal Aviation Administration	3,298,197,000	4,037,389,000	3,816,507,000	3,620,159,000	+321,962,000	-417,230,000	-196,348,000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1983 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1983 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1983 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Federal Highway Administration							
(Limitation on general operating expenses)	(188,500,000)	(202,687,000)	(198,600,000)	(202,687,000)	(+14,187,000)	---	(+4,087,000)
Motor carrier safety	11,600,000	13,020,000	13,020,000	13,020,000	+1,420,000	---	---
(By transfer)	(1,000,000)	---	---	---	(-1,000,000)	---	---
Motor carrier safety grants	---	10,000,000	8,000,000	10,000,000	+10,000,000	---	+2,000,000
Highway safety research and development	7,700,000	8,600,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	+800,000	-100,000	---
(By transfer)	(300,000)	---	---	---	(-300,000)	---	---
Highway beautification	500,000	---	---	---	-500,000	---	---
Highway-related safety grants:							
(Limitation on obligations)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	---	---	---
(Liquidation of contract authorization) (Trust Fund)	(22,998,000)	(9,738,000)	(9,738,000)	(9,738,000)	(-13,260,000)	---	---
Rescission of contract authority	-9,623,000	---	---	---	+9,623,000	---	---
Territorial highways	3,000,000	---	---	---	-3,000,000	---	---
Railroad-highway crossings demonstration projects	---	---	35,700,000	---	---	---	-35,700,000
Federal-aid highways							
(Limitation on obligations)	(12,375,000,000)	(12,600,000,000)	(12,600,000,000)	(12,600,000,000)	(+225,000,000)	---	---
(Liquidation of contract authorization)(Trust Fund)	(8,200,000,000)	(11,600,000,000)	(11,600,000,000)	(11,600,000,000)	(+3,400,000,000)	---	---
Interstate transfer grants-highways	518,000,000	---	---	---	-518,000,000	---	---
Right-of-way Revolving Fund (limitation on direct loans) (Trust Fund)	---	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(+30,000,000)	---	---
Bridge replacement	23,200,000	---	---	---	-23,200,000	---	---
Highway demonstration project	33,000,000	---	---	---	-33,000,000	---	---

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Access Highways to Lakes	---	---	---	4,270,000	+4,270,000	+4,270,000	+4,270,000
Waste isolation pilot project roads	---	---	---	5,800,000	+5,800,000	+5,800,000	+5,800,000
Total, Federal Highway Administration	587,377,000	31,620,000	65,220,000	41,590,000	-545,787,000	+9,970,000	-23,630,000
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration							
Operations and research	74,000,000	77,998,000	78,000,000	78,000,000	+4,000,000	+2,000	---
Highway traffic safety grants:							
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(103,552,000)	(118,000,000)	(118,000,000)	(118,000,000)	(+14,448,000)	---	---
State and community highway safety (limitation on obligations)	(95,000,000)	(77,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	(+23,000,000)	---
Alcohol safety incentive grants (limitation on obligations)	---	---	(37,950,000)	(37,950,000)	(+37,950,000)	(+37,950,000)	---
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	74,000,000	77,998,000	78,000,000	78,000,000	+4,000,000	+2,000	---
Federal Railroad Administration							
Office of the Administrator	13,000,000	13,867,000	11,680,000	11,680,000	-1,320,000	-2,187,000	---
Railroad safety	28,000,000	26,514,000	26,500,000	28,900,000	+900,000	+2,386,000	+2,400,000
Railroad research and development	17,000,000	16,675,000	16,225,000	16,225,000	-775,000	-450,000	---
Rail Service Assistance	31,675,000	9,340,000	14,240,000	24,240,000	-7,435,000	+14,900,000	+10,000,000
Authority to borrow	---	854,000	854,000	854,000	+854,000	---	---
(By transfer)	---	---	(10,000,000)	---	---	---	(-10,000,000)
Conrail labor protection	10,000,000	20,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	+6,000,000	-4,000,000	---
Conrail labor protection (by transfer)	(10,000,000)	---	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(-6,000,000)	(+4,000,000)	---
Rock Island labor protection	---	---	35,000,000	35,000,000	+35,000,000	+35,000,000	---
Northeast corridor improvement program	115,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	-15,000,000	---	---
Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	780,000,000	662,000,000	720,000,000	718,000,000	-62,000,000	+56,000,000	-2,000,000
Commuter rail service (by transfer)	(90,000,000)	---	---	---	(-90,000,000)	---	---
Payments to the Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund	7,600,000	---	---	---	-7,600,000	---	---

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1983 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1983 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1983 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing Funds:							
Appropriation	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Appropriation for debt reduction	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
(Limitation on loan guarantees)	(600,000,000)	---	---	---	(-600,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on new loan guarantees)	(100,000,000)	---	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(-80,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	---
Redeemable preference shares:							
Appropriation (Authority to borrow)	5,000,000	---	---	---	-5,000,000	---	---
Emergency rail facilities restoration (limitation on direct loans)	(2,301,000)	---	---	---	(-2,301,000)	---	---
Illinois feeder line assistance (by transfer)	---	---	(3,000,000)	---	---	---	(-3,000,000)
Total, Federal Railroad Administration	1,007,275,000	849,250,000	940,499,000	950,899,000	-56,376,000	+101,649,000	+10,400,000
Urban Mass Transportation Administration							
Administrative expenses	28,081,000	29,666,000	29,200,000	29,666,000	+1,585,000	---	+466,000
Research, development, and demonstrations and university research and training	58,250,000	52,000,000	54,800,000	54,800,000	-3,450,000	+2,800,000	---
Formula grants	1,268,500,000	1,973,500,000	2,488,592,200	2,388,592,200	+1,120,092,200	+415,092,200	-100,000,000
Discretionary grants	1,691,650,000	---	---	---	-1,691,650,000	---	---
(Limitation on obligations)	---	(1,100,000,000)	(1,250,000,000)	(1,200,000,000)	(+1,200,000,000)	(+100,000,000)	(-50,000,000)
(Liquidation of contract authorization) (Trust Fund)	---	(242,000,000)	(242,000,000)	(242,000,000)	(+242,000,000)	---	---
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(681,135,000)	---	---	---	(-681,135,000)	---	---

Interstate transfer grants-transit	412,000,000	380,000,000	335,000,000	270,000,000	-142,030,000	-110,000,000	-65,000,000
Washington Metro	240,000,000	230,000,000	275,000,000	230,000,000	-10,000,000	---	-45,000,000
Total, Urban Mass Transportation Administration	3,698,481,000	2,665,166,000	3,182,592,200	2,973,058,200	-725,422,800	+307,892,200	-209,534,000
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation							
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(1,716,000)	(1,825,000)	(1,800,000)	(1,800,000)	(+84,000)	(-25,000)	---
Research and Special Programs Administration							
Research and special programs	20,022,000	20,287,000	20,200,000	20,200,000	+178,000	-87,000	---
Office of the Inspector General							
Salaries and expenses	24,946,000	25,895,000	25,895,000	26,795,000	+1,849,000	+900,000	+900,000
Aid rissing investigative support	---	---	900,000	---	---	---	-900,000
Total, Office of the Inspector General	24,946,000	25,895,000	26,795,000	26,795,000	+1,849,000	+900,000	---
Total, title I, Department of Transportation:							
New budget (obligational) authority	11,158,046,350	10,256,845,456	10,646,618,656	10,210,829,656	-947,216,694	-46,015,800	-435,789,000
Appropriations	(11,162,924,000)	(10,256,255,000)	(10,789,528,200)	(10,210,239,200)	(-952,684,800)	(-46,015,800)	(-579,289,000)
Appropriations for debt reduction	(-254,650)	(-263,544)	(-263,544)	(-263,544)	(-8,894)	---	---
Authority to borrow	(5,000,000)	(854,000)	(854,000)	(854,000)	(-4,146,000)	---	---
Rescission	(-9,623,000)	---	(-143,500,000)	---	(+9,623,000)	---	(+143,500,000)
(By transfer)	(135,750,000)	---	(29,550,000)	(16,550,000)	(-119,200,000)	(+16,550,000)	(-13,000,000)
(Limitations)	(190,216,000)	(204,512,000)	(200,400,000)	(204,487,000)	(+14,271,000)	(-25,000)	(+4,087,000)
(Limitations on direct loans)	(2,301,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(+27,699,000)	---	---
(Limitations on loan guarantees)	(600,000,000)	---	---	---	(-600,000,000)	---	---
(Limitations on new loan guarantees)	(100,000,000)	---	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(-80,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	---
(Limitation on working capital fund)	(70,909,000)	(68,198,000)	(67,750,000)	(68,198,000)	(-2,711,000)	---	(+448,000)
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(9,241,685,000)	(12,729,738,000)	(12,724,738,000)	(12,729,738,000)	(+3,488,053,000)	---	(+5,000,000)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1983 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1983 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1983 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES							
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board							
Salaries and expenses	2,020,000	1,700,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	-120,000	+200,000	---
National Transportation Safety Board							
Salaries and expenses	19,970,000	19,735,000	20,615,000	21,062,000	+1,092,000	+1,327,000	+447,000
Civil Aeronautics Board							
Salaries and expenses	23,125,000	20,890,000	18,400,000	16,100,000	-7,025,000	-4,790,000	-2,300,000
(By transfer)	---	---	(2,400,000)	---	---	---	(-2,400,000)
Payments to air carriers	48,400,000	50,800,000	50,800,000	50,800,000	+2,400,000	---	---
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board	71,525,000	71,690,000	69,200,000	66,900,000	-4,625,000	-4,790,000	-2,300,000
Interstate Commerce Commission							
Salaries and expenses	65,600,000	58,038,000	59,000,000	62,000,000	-3,600,000	+3,962,000	+3,000,000
Payments for Directed Rail Service (limitation on obligations)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(10,000,000)	---	---	(+5,000,000)

Panama Canal Commission							
Operating expenses	405,000,000	424,362,000	418,962,000	409,662,000	+4,662,000	-14,700,000	-9,300,000
Capital outlay	29,024,000	29,438,000	29,438,000	29,438,000	+414,000	---	---
Total, Panama Canal Commission	434,024,000	453,800,000	448,400,000	439,100,000	+5,076,000	-14,700,000	-9,300,000
Department of the Treasury							
Office of the Secretary: (Investment in Fund Anticipation Notes)	(5,000,000)	---	---	---	(-5,000,000)	---	---
United States Railway Association							
Administrative expenses	2,950,000	---	2,500,000	2,100,000	-850,000	+2,100,000	-400,000
(By transfer)	---	---	(400,000)	(400,000)	(+400,000)	(+400,000)	---
Airline Deregulation Study Commission							
Salaries and expenses	---	---	---	(500,000)	(+500,000)	(+500,000)	(+500,000)
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority							
Interest payments	51,663,569	51,663,569	51,663,569	51,663,569	---	---	---
Total, title II, related agencies:							
New budget (obligational) authority	647,752,569	656,626,569	653,278,569	644,725,569	-3,027,000	-11,901,000	-8,553,000
(Limitation on obligations)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(10,000,000)	---	---	(+5,000,000)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1983 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1983 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1983 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
RECAPITULATION							
Grand total, titles I and II:							
New budget (obligational) authority	11,805,798,919	10,913,472,025	11,299,897,225	10,855,555,225	-950,243,694	-57,916,800	-444,342,000
Appropriations	(11,810,676,569)	(10,912,881,569)	(11,442,806,769)	(10,854,964,769)	(-955,711,800)	(-57,916,800)	(-587,842,000)
Appropriations for debt reduction	(-254,650)	(-263,544)	(-263,544)	(-263,544)	(-8,894)	---	---
Authority to borrow	(5,000,000)	(854,000)	(854,000)	(854,000)	(-4,146,000)	---	---
Rescission	(-9,623,000)	---	(-143,500,000)	---	(+9,623,000)	---	(+143,500,000)
(By transfer)	(135,750,000)	---	(32,350,000)	(16,950,000)	(-118,800,000)	(+16,950,000)	(-15,400,000)
(Limitations)	(190,216,000)	(204,512,000)	(200,400,000)	(204,487,000)	(+14,271,000)	(-25,000)	(+4,087,000)
(Limitations on obligations)	(13,350,000,000)	(14,622,000,000)	(15,022,950,000)	(14,882,950,000)	(+1,532,950,000)	(+260,950,000)	(-140,000,000)
(Limitations on direct loans)	(2,301,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(+27,699,000)	---	---
(Limitations on loan guarantees)	(600,000,000)	---	---	---	(-600,000,000)	---	---
(Limitations on new loan guarantees)	(100,000,000)	---	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(-80,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	---
(Limitation on working capital fund)	(70,909,000)	(68,198,000)	(67,750,000)	(68,198,000)	(-2,711,000)	---	(+448,000)
Memoranda:							
(Appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations)	(9,241,685,000)	(12,729,738,000)	(12,724,738,000)	(12,729,738,000)	(+3,488,053,000)	---	(+5,000,000)
(Appropriation for debt reduction)	(254,650)	(263,544)	(263,544)	(263,544)	(+8,894)	---	---
Total, appropriations including appropriations to liquidate contract authorization and appropriations for debt reduction	(21,047,738,569)	(23,643,473,569)	(24,024,898,769)	(23,585,556,769)	(+2,537,818,200)	(-57,916,800)	(-439,342,000)